

# भारत का राजपत्र The Gazette of India

प्राधिकार से प्रकाशित  
PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

सं. 29]  
No. 29]

शुक्र दिवस, शनिवार, जुलाई 20, 2002/आषाढ़ 29, 1924  
NEW DELHI, SATURDAY, JULY 20, 2002/ASADHA 29, 1924

इस भाग को निम्न संख्या दी जाती है जिससे कि यह जलम संकलन के रूप में  
रखे जा सके

Separate Paging is given to this Part in order that it may be filed as a  
separate compilation

## भाग II—खण्ड 3—उप-खण्ड (II) PART II—Section 3—Sub-Section (II)

भारत सरकार के मंत्रालयों (स्वा मंत्रालय को छोड़कर) द्वारा जारी किए गए सांविधिक आदेश और अधिसूचनाएँ  
Statutory Orders and Notifications Issued by the Ministries of the Government of India  
(other than the Ministry of Defence)

वित्त मंत्रालय  
(राजस्व विभाग)

केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क आयुक्त का कार्यालय  
मदुरै, 3 जुलाई, 2002

सं. 3/2002-सीमा शुल्क (एन टी)

का.आ. 2337.—सीमा शुल्क अधिनियम, 1962 धारा 9 जो भारत सरकार, वित्त मंत्रालय, राजस्व विभाग, नई दिल्ली के अधिसूचना सं. 33/94-सीमा शुल्क (एन टी) दिनांक 1-7-94 के साथ पठित, द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए मैं, एतद्वारा तमिलनाडु राज्य के, विरुधु-नगर जिला, शिवकाशी तालुका के शिवकाशी टाँकन को सीमा शुल्क अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 52) के अधीन शत प्रतिशत निर्यातोन्मुख उपक्रम स्थापित करने हेतु आडामार घोषित करता हूँ।

[फाइल सी.सं. IV/16/44/2002-टी-2]

के. परसुरामन, आयुक्त

MINISTRY OF FINANCE

(Department of Revenue)

OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER OF  
CENTRAL EXCISE

Madurai, the 3rd July, 2002

No. 3/2002-Customs(N T)

S.O. 2337.—In exercise of the powers conferred on me under Section 9 of the Customs Act, 1962 (52 of 1962) read with Notification No. 33/94-Customs (NT) dated 1-7-94 of the Government of India, Ministry of Finance, Department of Revenue, New Delhi, I hereby declare Sivakasi Town, Sivakasi Taluk, Virudhunagar District in the State of Tamil Nadu to be a warehousing station under the Customs Act, 1962 (52 of 1962) for the purpose of setting up of 100% Export Oriented Undertakings.

[File C.No.-IV/16/44/2002-T.2

K. PARASURAMAN, Commissioner

(आर्थिक कार्य विभाग)

(बैंकिंग प्रभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 25 जून, 2002

का. आ. 2338.—राष्ट्रीयकृत बैंक (प्रबंध और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध) स्कीम, 1970 के खण्ड 9 के उपखण्ड (1) एवं (2) के साथ पठित बैंककारी कंपनी (उपक्रमों का अर्जन एवं अंतरण) अधिनियम, 1970 की धारा 9 की उपधारा 3 के खण्ड (च) द्वारा प्रवृत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक से परामर्श करने के पश्चात्, एतद्वारा बैंक ऑफ इंडिया अधिकारी संघ के महासचिव श्री वी. ईश्वरन (जो मध्य प्रबंधन स्केल-II में चेन्नई अंचल में बैंक की सैन्य शाखा में सेनात हैं) को 25 जून, 2002 से तीन वर्ष की अवधि के लिए अथवा जब तक वे बैंक ऑफ इंडिया के अधिकारी रहते हैं अथवा जब तक वे 60 वर्ष की आयु प्राप्त नहीं कर लेते, इनमें से जो भी पहले हो, बैंक ऑफ इंडिया के निदेशक मण्डल में निदेशक के रूप में नामित करती है। यह नामांकन बैंक ऑफ महाराष्ट्र अधिकारी संघ द्वारा मुम्बई उच्च न्यायालय में दायर वर्ष 2001 की रिट याचिका संख्या 5394 के निर्णय के अधीन होगी।

[फा. सं. 9/23/2001-बीओ-I]

रमेश चन्द, अवसर सचिव

(Department of Economic Affairs)

(Banking Division)

New Delhi, the 25th June, 2002

S.O. 2338.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (f) of sub-section (3) of Section 9 of the Banking Companies (Acquisition and Transfer of Undertakings) Act, 1970, read with sub-clause (1) and (2) of clause 9 of the Nationalised Banks (Management and Miscellaneous Provisions) Scheme, 1970, the Central Government, after consultation with the Reserve Bank of India, hereby nominates Shri V. Eswaran, General Secretary, Bank of India Officers' Federation (posted at Bank's Santhome Branch, Chennai Zone in Middle Management Scale-II) as a Director on the Board of Bank of India for a period of three years with effect from 25th June, 2002 or until he ceases to be an officer of Bank of India or till he attains the age of sixty years, whichever is earlier. The nomination will be subject to the decision of the Mumbai High Court in Writ Petition No. 5394 of 2001 filed by Bank of Maharashtra Officers Association.

[F. No. 9/23/2001-B.O.-I]

RAMESH CHAND, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 9 जुलाई, 2002

का. आ. 2339.—भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक अधिनियम, 1934 (1934 का 2) की धारा 8 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (क) और उपधारा (4) के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, एतद्वारा डा. बिमल जालान को 22 नवम्बर, 2002 से आरम्भ होकर 21 नवम्बर, 2004 को समाप्त होने वाली और 2 वर्ष की अवधि के लिए भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक के गवर्नर के पद पर पुनः नियुक्त करती है।

[फा. सं. 7/10/97-बीओ-I]

शेखर अग्रवाल, संयुक्त सचिव

New Delhi, the 9th July, 2002

S.O. 2339.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (a) of sub-section (1) read with sub-section (4) of Section 8 of the Reserve Bank of India Act, 1934, the Central Government, hereby re-appoints Dr. Bimal Jalan as Governor of the Reserve Bank of India for a further period of two years commencing from 22nd November, 2002 and ending on 21st November, 2004.

[F.No. 7/10/97-BO.-I]

SHEKHAR AGARWAL, Jt. Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 9 जुलाई, 2002

का. आ. 2340.—भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक अधिनियम, 1934 की धारा 8 की उपधारा (4) के साथ पठित उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (क) के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, एतद्वारा डा. राकेश मोहन, वर्तमान निदेशक, इंडियन काउंसिल फॉर रिसर्च ऑन इंटरनेशनल इकॉनॉमिक रिलेशन (आईसीआरआईआर) को डा. वाई. वी. रेड्डी के स्थान पर उनके आईएमएफ में कार्यकारी निदेशक के रूप में नियुक्ति होने पर तीन वर्ष की अवधि के लिए भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक में उप गवर्नर के रूप में नियुक्त करती है।

[फा. सं. 8/17/2002-बीओ-I]

शेखर अग्रवाल, संयुक्त सचिव

New Delhi, the 9th July, 2002

S.O. 2340.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (a) of sub-section (1) read with sub-section (4) of Section 8 of the Reserve Bank of India Act, 1934, the Central Government, hereby appoints Dr. Rakesh Mohan, presently Director, Indian Council for Research on International Economic Relations (ICRIER) as Deputy Governor of the Reserve Bank of India for a period of three years vice Dr. Y.V. Reddy on his appointment as Executive Director, I.M.F.

[F.No.8/17/2002-B.O.-I]

SHEKHAR AGARWAL, Jt. Secy.

लघु उद्योग मंत्रालय

New Delhi, the 8th July, 2002

नई दिल्ली, 8 जुलाई, 2002

का.आ. 2341.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, राजभाषा (संघ के शासकीय प्रयोजनों के लिए प्रयोग) नियम, 1976 के नियम (10) के उपनियम (4) के अनुसरण में लघु उद्योग मंत्रालय के अधीन क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय, रवि किरण बिल्डिंग, चन्दर नगर, गुडगांव, जिसमें 80 प्रतिशत कर्मचारीबृन्द ने हिन्दी का कार्यसाधक ज्ञान प्राप्त कर लिया है, को अधिसूचित करती है।

[सं.ई.-12012/1/2002/हिन्दी]

शंकर अग्रवाल, संयुक्त सचिव

MINISTRY OF SMALL SCALE INDUSTRY

New Delhi, the 8th July, 2002

S.O. 2341.—In pursuance of Sub-rule [4] of Rule [10] of the Official Language [Use for official purposes of the Union] Rules, 1976, the Central Government hereby notifies the Regional Office, Ravi Kiran Building, Chander Nagar, Guragon under the Ministry of SSI, whose 80% staff have acquired working knowledge of Hindi.

[No.E.-12012/1/2002-Hindi]

SHANKAR AGGARWAL, Jt. Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 8 जुलाई, 2002

का.आ. 2342.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, राजभाषा (संघ के शासकीय प्रयोजनों के लिए प्रयोग) नियम, 1976 के नियम (10) के उपनियम (4) के अनुसरण में लघु उद्योग मंत्रालय के अधीन क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय, 118-बी, शोपिंग कॉम्प्लेक्स, सेक्टर-18, नोएडा, जिसमें 80 प्रतिशत कर्मचारीबृन्द ने हिन्दी का कार्यसाधक ज्ञान प्राप्त कर लिया है, को अधिसूचित करती है।

[सं.ई.-12012/1/2002-हिन्दी]

शंकर अग्रवाल, संयुक्त सचिव

S.O.2342.—In pursuance of Sub rule [4] of Rule [10] of the Official Language [Use for official purposes of the Union] Rules, 1976, the Central Government hereby notifies Regional Office, 118-B, Shopping Complex, Sector-18, Noida under the Ministry of SSI, whose 80% staff have acquired working knowledge of Hindi.

[No. E-12012/1/2002-Hindi]

SHANKAR AGGARWAL, Jt. Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 8 जुलाई, 2002

का.आ. 2343.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, राजभाषा (संघ के शासकीय प्रयोजनों के लिए प्रयोग) नियम, 1976 के नियम (10) के उपनियम (4) के अनुसरण में लघु उद्योग मंत्रालय के अधीन राष्ट्रीय लघु उद्योग निगम लिमिटेड, एनएस-आईसी भवन, ओखला इन्डस्ट्रियल इस्टेट, नई दिल्ली-110-020 (भारत), जिसमें 80 प्रतिशत कर्मचारीबृन्द ने हिन्दी का कार्यसाधक ज्ञान प्राप्त कर लिया है, को अधिसूचित करती है।

[सं.ई.-12012/1/2002-हिन्दी]

शंकर अग्रवाल, संयुक्त सचिव

New Delhi, the 8th July, 2002

S.O. 2343.—In pursuance of Sub-rule [4] of Rule [10] of the Official Language [Use for official purposes of the Union] Rules, 1976, the Central Government hereby notifies the National Small Industries Corporation Ltd., New Delhi under the Ministry of SSI, whose 80% staff have acquired working knowledge of Hindi.

[No. E-12012/1/2002-Hindi]

SHANKAR AGGARWAL, Jt. Secy.

स्वास्थ्य एवं परिवार कल्याण मंत्रालय

(स्वास्थ्य विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 5 जून, 2002

का.आ. 2344.—दत्त चिकित्सक अधिनियम, (1948 का 16) का धारा 10 की उपधारा (2) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्र सरकार भारतीय एंजाइम विनिर्माण परिषद् से परामर्श करने के पश्चात् एतद्वारा उक्त अधिनियम की अनुसूची के भाग-I में आगे और निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है; अर्थात्

उक्त अनुसूची के भाग-I में राजीव गांधी स्वास्थ्य विज्ञान विश्वविद्यालय बंगलूर, के क्रम संख्या 47 और उससे संबंधित प्रविष्टियों के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टियां जोड़ी जाएंगी, अर्थात् :

47. राजीव गांधी स्वास्थ्य विज्ञान विश्वविद्यालय, (आर जी यू ओ एच एस) बंगलूर      वंद्य चिकित्सा में निष्णात येनेपोया दंत कालेज, मंगलूर के स्नातकोत्तर छात्रों के संबंध में यह अर्हता तभी एक मान्यता प्राप्त अर्हता होगी यदि यह 23 मार्च, 2002 अथवा उसके बाद प्रदान की गई हो।

(i) एम डी एस (ओरल मेडिसिन)

[संख्या बी-12018/14/2001-पीएमएस]

एस. के. राव, निदेशक

## MINISTRY OF HEALTH AND FAMILY WELFARE

(Department of Health)

New Delhi, the 5th July, 2002

S.O. 2344.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of Section 10 of the Dentists Act (16 of 1948), the Central Government, after consulting the Dental Council of India hereby makes the following further amendment in Part-I of the Schedule to the said Act namely :—

In Part-I of the said Schedule against Serial Number 47 of Rajiv Gandhi University of Health Sciences, Bangalore and the entries relating thereto, the following entries will be added namely :—

47, Rajiv Gandhi University of Health Sciences, (RGUOHS), Bangalore.	Master of Dental Surgery The following dental qualification shall be recognized qualification in respect of P.G. students of Yenepoya Dental College, Mangalore when granted on or after 23rd March, 2002 :	M.D.S. (Oral Medicine) Rajiv Gandhi University of Health Sciences, Bangalore.
	(i) MDS (Oral Medicine)	

[No. V-12018/14/2001-PMS]

S. K. RAO, Director

नई दिल्ली, 9 जुलाई, 2002

का. आ. 2345:—केन्द्रीय सरकार भारतीय आयु-विज्ञान परिषद अधिनियम, 1956 (1956 का 102) की धारा 11 के उपखण्ड (2) के द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए भारतीय चिकित्सा परिषद के परामर्श के पश्चात् उक्त अधिनियम की प्रथम अनुसूची में निम्नलिखित और संशोधन करती है, अर्थात् :—

उक्त अनुसूची में “कानपुर विश्वविद्यालय” के पश्चात् “विश्वविद्यालय या आयुविज्ञान संस्थान” के शीर्षक के अधीन और उससे संबंधित प्रविष्टियों के “मान्यताप्राप्त आयु-विज्ञान अर्हता” और “संक्षिप्ताक्षर” शीर्षक के अधीन क्रमशः निम्न प्रकार से रखा जाएगा, अर्थात् :—

विश्वविद्यालय आयुविज्ञान संस्थान	मान्यता प्राप्त आयुविज्ञान अर्हता	संक्षिप्ताक्षर
“कन्नूर विश्वविद्यालय	बैचलर ऑफ मेडिसिन एण्ड बैचलर एम. बी. ऑफ सर्जरी (यह अर्हता तभी मान्यता प्राप्त चिकित्सीय अर्हता होगी जब अकाडेमी ऑफ मेडिकल साइंसेज पेरीवारम, कन्नूर में प्रशिक्षित छात्रों को मई, 2001 में या उसके पश्चात् प्रदान की गई हो।)	बी. बी. एस.”

[सं. बी.-11015/2/2002-एमई (सीत-I)]

पी. जी. कलाप्रसन्न, अवर सचिव



New Delhi, the 9th July, 2002

नागर विमानन मंत्रालय

S.O.2345. In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of the section 11 of the Indian Medical Council Act, 1956 (102 of 1956), the Central Government after consultation with the Medical Council of India, hereby makes the following further amendment in the First Schedule to the said Act, namely :

In the said First Schedule, after "Kanpur University" under the heading "University or Medical Institution" and the entries relating thereto under the headings "Recognised Medical Qualifications" and "Abbreviation" the following shall respectively be inserted, namely :

University or Medical Institution	Recognised Medical Qualification	Abbreviation
"Kannur University"	Bachelor of Medicine and Bachelor of Surgery (This qualification shall be a recognised medical qualification when granted in or after May, 2001 in respect of students being trained at Academy of Medical Sciences, Pariyaram, Kannur)"	M.B.B.S.

[No.V.11015/2/2002-ME(Policy-I)]

P. G. KALADHARAN, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 4 जुलाई, 2002

का. आ. 2346:—केन्द्रीय सरकार, राजभाषा (संघ के शासकीय प्रयोजनों के लिए प्रयोग), नियम 1976 के नियम 10 के उप नियम (4) के अनुसार, में, नागर विमानन मंत्रालय के अधीनवर्ती कार्यालय इंडियन एयरलाइंस लि. के हैदराबाद (बेस) स्टेशन को, जिसके 80 प्रतिशत से अधिक कर्मचारी-बृन्द ने हिन्दी का कार्य-साधक ज्ञान प्राप्त कर लिया है, अधिसूचित करती है।

[संख्या ई. 11011/01/2000-रा. भा.]

चन्द्र भानु नारनौली, निदेशक ( राजभाषा )

## MINISTRY OF CIVIL AVIATION

New Delhi, the 4th July, 2002

S.O. 2346. In pursuance of sub-rule (4) of Rule 10 of the Official Languages (Use for the Official Purposes of the Union) Rules, 1976, the Central Government, hereby notifies the office of the Hyderabad (Base) Station of Indian Airlines Ltd. a subordinate office of Ministry of Civil Aviation, whereof, more than 80% staff have acquired the working knowledge of Hindi.

[ No. E.11011/01/2000-O.L ]

C. B. NARNAULI, Director (OL )

विज्ञान और प्रौद्योगिकी मंत्रालय

(विज्ञान और प्रौद्योगिकी विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 20 मई, 2002

का.आ. 2347.—केन्द्र सरकार सार्वजनिक परिसर/अनाधिकृत वखलकारों की बेदखली अधिनियम, 1971 (1971 का 40) के खंड 3 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए एतद् द्वारा दिनांक 5 अगस्त, 1961 की यथासंशोधित अधिसूचना संख्या एस.ओ. 2067 एवं पुनः संशोधित दिनांक 6 जून 1964 की अधिसूचना संख्या एस.ओ. 2106 तथा इसके बाद पुनः दिनांक 12 नवम्बर 1984 को संशोधित अधिसूचना संख्या एस.ओ. 3951 के अनुसार भारत सरकार निर्माण, आवास एवं आपूर्ति मंत्रालय की 28 जनवरी 1959 की अधिसूचना सं. 307 में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है।

उक्त अधिसूचना के नीचे दी गई तालिका के क्र.सं. 15 के कॉलम 1 और 2 की वर्तमान प्रविष्टियों के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित प्रकार से प्रविष्टियां की जाएंगी :

क्र.सं. सम्पदा अधिकारी के रूप में कार्य करने के लिए नामित अधिकारी का पदनाम

अधिकार क्षेत्र

1	2	3
15 (क) मौसम विज्ञान के उपमहानिदेशक (प्रशासन एवं भंडार) नई दिल्ली	भारत मौसम विज्ञान विभाग के प्रशासनिक नियंत्रण के अधीन आने वाले परिसर।	
(ख) मौसम विज्ञान (प्रशासन) मौसम विज्ञान के महानिदेशक का कार्यालय, नई दिल्ली	दिल्ली/नई दिल्ली स्थित भारत मौसम विज्ञान विभाग के प्रशासनिक नियंत्रण के अधीन आने वाले परिसर।	

1

2

3

(ग) मौसम विज्ञान के अपरमहानिदेशक (अनुसंधान) पुणे	भारत मौसम विज्ञान विभाग के प्रशासनिक नियंत्रण के अधीन स्थानीय सीमा में उनके अधिकार क्षेत्र में आने वाले परिसर ।
(घ) मौसम विज्ञान के उपमहानिदेशक (उपरितन वायु उपकरण), लोदी रोड़, नई दिल्ली	भारत मौसम विज्ञान विभाग के प्रशासनिक नियंत्रण के अधीन उनके अधिकार क्षेत्र के अन्तर्गत आया नगर, नई बिल्ली और हाईड्रोजन फैक्ट्री, आगरा की स्थानीय सीमाओं में आने वाले परिसर ।
(ङ) मौसम विज्ञान के उपमहानिदेशक प्रादेशिक मौसम केन्द्र, नई दिल्ली	भारत मौसम विज्ञान विभाग के प्रशासनिक नियंत्रण के अधीन स्थानीय सीमाओं में उनके अधिकार क्षेत्र में आने वाले परिसर ।
(च) मौसम विज्ञान के उपमहानिदेशक प्रादेशिक मौसम केन्द्र, मुम्बई	भारत मौसम विज्ञान विभाग के प्रशासनिक नियंत्रण के अधीन स्थानीय सीमाओं में उनके अधिकार क्षेत्र में आने वाले परिसर ।
(छ) मौसम विज्ञान के उपमहानिदेशक प्रादेशिक मौसम केन्द्र, कोलकाता	भारत मौसम विज्ञान विभाग के प्रशासनिक नियंत्रण के अधीन स्थानीय सीमाओं में उनके अधिकार क्षेत्र में आने वाले परिसर ।
(ज) मौसम विज्ञान के उपमहानिदेशक प्रादेशिक मौसम केन्द्र, चेन्नई	भारत मौसम विज्ञान विभाग के प्रशासनिक नियंत्रण के अधीन स्थानीय सीमाओं में उनके अधिकार क्षेत्र में आने वाले परिसर ।
(झ) मौसम विज्ञान के उपमहानिदेशक प्रादेशिक मौसम केन्द्र, नागपुर	भारत मौसम विज्ञान विभाग के प्रशासनिक नियंत्रण के अधीन स्थानीय सीमाओं में उनके अधिकार क्षेत्र में आने वाले परिसर ।
(ण) मौसम विज्ञान के उपमहानिदेशक प्रादेशिक मौसम केन्द्र, गुवाहाटी	भारत मौसम विज्ञान विभाग के प्रशासनिक नियंत्रण के अधीन स्थानीय सीमाओं में उनके अधिकार क्षेत्र में आने वाले परिसर ।
(ट) निदेशक, खगोल विज्ञान केन्द्र, कोलकाता	भारत मौसम विज्ञान विभाग के प्रशासनिक नियंत्रण के अधीन स्थानीय सीमाओं में उनके अधिकार क्षेत्र में आने वाले परिसर ।
(ठ) प्रभारी मौसम विज्ञानी, केन्द्रीय भूकम्प वेधशाला, शिलांग ।	भारत मौसम विज्ञान विभाग के प्रशासनिक नियंत्रण के अधीन स्थानीय सीमाओं में उनके अधिकार क्षेत्र में आने वाले परिसर ।

इन संशोधनों के लागू होने से वर्तमान प्राधिकार समाप्त हो जाएंगे ।

[सं. जी. डब्ल्यू-21500]

टी. के. गुप्ता, अवर सचिव

## MINISTRY OF SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY

(Department of Science & Technology)

New Delhi, the 20th May, 2002

S.O. 2347.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 3 of the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised Occupants) Act, 1971 (40 of 1971), the Central Govt. hereby makes the following amendments in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Works, Housing and Supply No. 307 dated 28th January, 1959 as amended vide Notification No. S.O. 2067 dated 5th August, 1961, again amended vide Notification No. S.O. 2106 dated the 6th June, 1964, and further amended vide Notification No. S.O. 3951 dated 12th November, 1984.

In the table below of the said Notification, for the existing entries in columns 1 and 2 against S. No. 15, the following shall be substituted namely :

15. S. No.	Designation of the Officer designated to act as Estate Officer	Jurisdiction of power
(a)	Deputy Director General of Meteorology, (Administration and Stores), New Delhi.	Premises under the administrative control of India Meteorological Department.
(b)	Meteorologist (Administration), Office of the Director General of Meteorology, New Delhi.	Premises under the administrative control of India Meteorological Department at New Delhi/Delhi.
(c)	Additional Director General of Meteorology (Research), Pune.	Premises under the administrative control of India Meteorological Department within the local limits of their jurisdiction.
(d)	Deputy Director General of Meteorology (Upper Air Instrument), Lodhi Road, New Delhi.	Premises under the administrative control of India Meteorological Department within the local limits of Ayanagar, New Delhi and Hydrogen factory, Agra under their jurisdiction.
(e)	Deputy Director General of Meteorology, Regional Meteorological Centre, New Delhi.	Premises under the administrative control of India Meteorological Department within the local limits of their jurisdiction.
(f)	Deputy Director General of Meteorology, Regional Meteorological Centre, Mumbai.	Premises under the administrative control of India Meteorological Department within the local limits of their jurisdiction.
(g)	Deputy Director General of Meteorology, Regional Meteorological Centre, Kolkata.	Premises under the administrative control of India Meteorological Department within the local limits of their jurisdiction.
(h)	Deputy Director General of Meteorology, Regional Meteorological Centre, Chennai.	Premises under the administrative control of India Meteorological Department within the local limits of their jurisdiction.
(i)	Deputy Director General of Meteorology, Regional Meteorological Centre, Nagpur.	Premises under the administrative control of India Meteorological Department within the local limits of their jurisdiction.
(j)	Deputy Director General of Meteorology, Regional Meteorological Centre, Guwahati.	Premises under the administrative control of India Meteorological Department within the local limits of their jurisdiction.
(k)	Director, Positional Astronomy Centre, Kolkata.	Premises under the administrative control of India Meteorological Department within the local limits of their jurisdiction.
(l)	Meteorologist Incharge, Central Seismological Observatory, Shillong.	Premises under the administrative control of India Meteorological Department within the local limits of their jurisdiction.

These amendments will be in supersession of the existing authorizations.

[ No. GW-21500 ]

T. K. GUPTA, Under Secy.

उपभोक्ता मामले, खाद्य और सार्वजनिक वितरण मंत्रालय  
(उपभोक्ता मामले विभाग)

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 10 जुलाई, 2002

का.आ. 2348.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारतीय विधिक माप विज्ञान संस्थान नियम, 1980 के नियम 8 के उपनियम (2) के अनुसरण में भारतीय विधिक माप विज्ञान संस्थान, रांची की सलाहकार समिति का पुनर्गठन करती है जोकि राजपत्र में इस आदेश के प्रकाशन की तारीख से निम्नलिखित व्यक्तियों से मिलकर बनेगी, अर्थात् :—

अध्यक्ष

1. सचिव,  
उपभोक्ता मामले विभाग

सदस्य

2. अपर सचिव या संयुक्त सचिव,  
उपभोक्ता मामले विभाग।
3. विधि मंत्रालय का प्रतिनिधि,  
शाखा सचिवालय, कोलकाता।
4. नियंत्रक, विधिक माप विज्ञान, हिमाचल प्रदेश।
5. नियंत्रक, विधिक माप विज्ञान, झारखंड।
6. नियंत्रक, विधिक माप विज्ञान, कर्नाटक।
7. नियंत्रक, विधिक माप विज्ञान, गुजरात।
8. भारतीय मानक ब्यूरो के महानिदेशक का प्रतिनिधि,  
नई दिल्ली।
9. राष्ट्रीय भौतिकी प्रयोगशाला के निदेशक का प्रतिनिधि  
नई दिल्ली।
10. वाणिज्य मंडल बिहार का नाम, निर्देशिनी, पटना।
11. मैकेनिकल इंजीनियरिंग कंसल्टेंट्स  
(मेकॉन) का प्रतिनिधि, रांची  
पदेन सदस्य
12. निदेशक, विधिक माप विज्ञान,  
उपभोक्ता मामले विभाग  
पदेन संयोजक
13. निदेशक, विधिक माप विज्ञान संस्थान, रांची।

[फा. सं. डब्ल्यू एम 2 (8)/01]

एस. नोटियाल, अपर सचिव,

MINISTRY OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS, FOOD  
AND PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION

(Department of Consumer Affairs)

ORDER

New Delhi, the 10th July, 2002

S.O. 2348.—In pursuance of sub-rule (2) of rule 8 of the Indian Institute of Legal Metrology Rules, 1980 the Central Government hereby re-constitutes the Advisory Committee of the Indian Institute of Legal Metrology, Ranchi, consisting of the following person, with effect from the date of publication of this Order in the Official Gazette, namely:—

Chairperson :

1. Secretary,  
Department of Consumer Affairs.

Members :

2. Additional Secretary or Joint Secretary,  
Department of Consumer Affairs.
3. Representative of Ministry of Law,  
Branch Secretariat, Kolkata.
4. Controller, Legal Metrology,  
Himachal Pradesh.
5. Controller, Legal Metrology,  
Jharkhand.
6. Controller, Legal Metrology,  
Karnataka.
7. Controller, Legal Metrology,  
Gujarat.
8. Representative of the Director General,  
Bureau of Indian Standards,  
New Delhi.
9. Representative of the Director,  
National Physical Laboratory,  
New Delhi.
10. Nominee of Bihar Chamber of Commerce,  
Patna.
11. Representative of Mechanical Engineering  
Consultants (MECON), Ranchi.

Ex-Officio Member :  
12. Director, Legal Metrology,  
Department of Consumer Affairs.

Ex-Officio Convener :

13. Director,  
Indian Institute of Legal Metrology,  
Ranchi.

[ File No. WM 2(8)/01 ]

S. NAUTIYAL, Add. Secy.

पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 8 जुलाई 2002

का.आ. 2349.—केन्द्रीय सरकार राजभाषा (संघ के शासकीय प्रयोजनों के लिए प्रयोग) नियम, 1976 के नियम 10 के उप नियम (4) के अनुसरण में पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय के प्रशासनिक नियंत्रणाधीन सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र के उपक्रमों के निम्नलिखित कार्यालयों को जिनके 80 या अधिक प्रतिशत कर्मचारीवृन्द ने हिन्दी कार्यसाधक ज्ञान प्राप्त कर लिया है, अधिसूचित करती है:—

हिन्दुस्तान पेट्रोलियम कार्पोरेशन लिमिटेड

1. मथुरा टी ओ पी  
गेट नं. 9 के पास, मथुरा रिफाइनरी,  
मथुरा-281005

2. औरंगाबाद क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय,  
प्लॉट नं. 39, सेक्टर-जी, टाऊन सेंटर, सिडको,  
औरंगाबाद-431003

3. गांधीनगर एलपीजी क्षेत्र,  
चारा सोनीपुर रोड, सरहद-382640  
जिला : गांधीनगर, गुजरात

4. अहमदाबाद क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय  
प्रत्यक्ष विक्रय, मेमनगर फायर स्टेशन के पीछे,  
पो.बा. नं. 4032, नवरंगपुरा,  
अहमदाबाद-380009

5. वाशी टर्मिनल डी-99, टीटीसी, इंडस्ट्रियल एरिया,  
पो. बा. नं. 2, वाशी,  
नवी मुंबई-400705

6. माहुल भराई संयंत्र,  
माहुल रोड, खैबर,  
मुंबई

7. पटना डिपो,  
पटना-गया रेलवे गुमटी,  
मिठापुर, पटना-800001

8. पुनपुन टीओपी,  
इंडियन आयल टर्मिनल  
सिपाड़ा, पटना

9. भागलपुर ल्यूब डिपो,  
इशाचक, भागलपुर-812001 (बिहार)

10. बरौनी टर्मिनल,  
सिर्वाल पोखर, पोस्ट-उलाव,  
बेगुसराय-851114

11. धनबाद आईआरडी  
रेलवे सिनेमा रोड,  
धनबाद-826001

12. भागलपुर डिपो, इशाचक,  
रेलवे पुल के निकट  
भागलपुर-812008

13. सूस्त क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय,  
पोस्ट : इच्छापुर,  
सूस्त-394510

14. भोपाल क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय (प्रत्यक्ष बिक्री),  
गौतमनगर पोस्ट : गोविन्दपुरा,  
भोपाल-462023

इंडियन आयल कार्पोरेशन लिमिटेड (विपणन प्रभाग)

15. राजस्थान राज्य कार्यालय,  
विपणन प्रभाग, राधास्वामी स-संग भवन के पास,  
आदर्श नगर, जयपुर-302004

16. चंडीगढ़ एएफएस  
चंडीगढ़

17. पानीपत मंडल कार्यालय,  
पानीपत

18. मथुरा टर्मिनल,  
मथुरा

इंडियन आयल कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड (रिफाइनरी प्रभाग)

19. पानीपत रिफाइनरी,  
पानीपत-132140

[सं. 11011(1)/2002-2003 (हिन्दी)]  
सी. पी. सिंह, उप निदेशक (रा. भा.)

# MINISTRY OF PETROLEUM AND NATURAL GAS

New Delhi, the 8th July, 2002

S.O. 2349.—In pursuance of Sub-rule (4) of Rule 10 of the Official Language (Use for official purposes of the Union) Rules, 1976, the Central Government hereby notifies the following offices of the Public Sector Undertakings under the administrative control of the Ministry of Petroleum & Natural Gas, the 80 or more per cent staff whereof have acquired working knowledge of Hindi :-

Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Ltd.:

1. Mathura TOP,  
Near Gate No. 9, Mathura Refinery,  
Mathura-281 005.
2. Aurangabad Regional Office,  
Plot No. 9, Sector-G, Town Centre,  
Sidco, Aurangabad-431 003.
3. Gandhinagar LPG Region,  
Chara Sonipur Road, Sardhav-382 640,  
District Gandhinagar, Gujarat.
4. Ahmedabad Regional Office (Direct Sales),  
(Behind Memnagar Fire Station),  
P. B. No. 4032, Navrangpura,  
Ahmedabad-380 009.
5. Vashi Terminal, D-99, TTC Industrial Area,  
P. B. No. 2, Vashi,  
Navi Mumbai-400 705.
6. Mahul Bottling Plant,  
Mahul Road, Chemboor, Mumbai.

7. Patna Depot,  
Patna-Gaya Railway Gunti,  
Mithapur, Patna-800 001.

8. Punpun TOP,  
Indian Oil Terminal,  
Siparah, Patna.

9. Bhagalpur Lube Depot, Ishakchak,  
Bhagalpur 812 001 (Bihar).

10. Barauni Terminal, Singhaul Pokhar,  
Post : Ulau, Begusarai-851 114.

11. Dhanbad IRD,  
Railway Cinema Road,  
Dhanbad-826 001.

12. Bhagalpur Depot, Ishachak,  
(Near Railway Bridge),  
Bhagalpur-812 008.

13. Surat Regional Office,  
PO : Ichhapur,  
Surat-394 510.

14. Bhopal Regional Office (Direct Sales),  
Gautam Nagar, Post : Govindpura,  
Bhopal-462 023.

Indian Oil Corporation Ltd. (Marketing Division) :

15. Rajaasthan State Office,  
(Marketing Division),  
(Near Radha Swami Satsang Bhavan),  
Adarsh Nagar, Jaipur-302 004.
16. Chandigarh AFS,  
Chandigarh.
17. Panipat Divisional Office,  
Panipat.
18. Mathura Terminal,  
Mathura.

Indian Oil Corporation Ltd. (Refinery Division) :

19. Panipat Refinery,  
Panipat-132 140.

[No. 11011(1)/2002-2003 (Hindi)]  
C. P. SINGH, Dy. Director (OL)

नई दिल्ली, 10 जुलाई, 2002

का. आ. 2350—केन्द्रीय सरकार ने पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1982 (1982 का 50) (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त अधिनियम कहा गया है) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन जारी की गई भारत के राजपत्र में तारीख 17 नवम्बर 2001 में यथाप्रकाशित भारत सरकार के पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या का. आ. 3158 तारीख 13 नवम्बर, 2001 द्वारा गुजरात राज्य में मुन्दा पत्तनस्थित अपरिष्कृत तेल संस्थापन (सी.ओ.टी.) से पंजाब राज्य में मटिडा तक मुन्दा-मटिडा अपरिष्कृत तेल पाइपलाइन के माध्यम से अपरिष्कृत तेल के परिवहन के लिए एक पाइपलाइन गुरु गोबिन्द सिंह रिफाइनरीज लिमिटेड (हिन्दुस्तान पेट्रोलियम कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड की समनुबन्गी) द्वारा अपरिष्कृत तेल के परिवहन के लिए पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए उक्त अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार के अर्जन के अपने आशय की घोषणा की थी ;

और उक्त अधिसूचना की प्रतियां जनता को तारीख 4 दिसम्बर 2001 को उपलब्ध करा दी गई थी ;

और सक्षम प्राधिकारी ने उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 8 की उपधारा (1) के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार को अपनी रिपोर्ट दे दी है ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार का उक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने के पश्चात्, यह समाधान हो गया है कि इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाना चाहिए ;

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 8 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, घोषणा करती है कि इस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमि में पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिए उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित किया जाता है ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 8 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए यह निदेश देती है कि उक्त भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार, केन्द्रीय सरकार में निहित होने की बजाए सभी विलक्षणताओं से मुक्त, गुरु गोबिन्द सिंह रिफाइनरीज लिमिटेड (हिन्दुस्तान पेट्रोलियम कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड की समनुबन्गी) में निहित होगा।

## अनुसूची

तहसील: जोधपुर		जिला: जोधपुर		राज्य: राजस्थान	
क्र.स.	गाँव का नाम	संकेत नं.	हिस्सा क्रमांक	ROU क्षेत्रफल	
				बिघा	बिस्वा
	1	2	3	4	
1	रोहिला कला	389		1	00
		390		0	18
		393		0	03
		392		1	12
		402		1	01
		403		1	00
		405		1	10
		406		0	01
		408		1	00
		409		0	02
		421		1	08
		426		1	03
		429		1	06
		431		0	02
		428		0	18
		432		1	03
		433		0	01
		376	1; नाला सरकारी भूमि	1	02
		368		0	01
		363	गोवर सरकारी भूमि	2	04
		371		0	04
		372		0	01
		372	1; कार्ट ट्रेक सा.मि. वि.	0	03
		374		0	03
		375		2	10
		244	नाला सरकारी भूमि	0	05
		375	1	0	01
		235		0	01
		237		1	00
		238		1	04
		239		0	16
		240		1	01
2	रोहिला खुर्द	87		0	10
		93		3	19
		92		0	01
		91		0	09



तहसील:जोधपुर		जिला:जोधपुर		राज्य:राजस्थान	
क्र.म.	गाँव का नाम	सर्वेक्षण नं.	हिस्सा क्रमांक	ROU शीतफल	
स.				बिघा	बिघना
	1	2	3	4	
2	रोहिला खुर्द (जारी )	94	कार्ट ट्रैक सरकारी भूमि	0	02
		96		1	04
		97		2	15
		99		0	06
		102		1	18
		103		0	01
		127	कार्ट ट्रैक सरकारी भूमि	0	03
		159		5	09
		161		0	07
		160		2	00
		155		3	01
		150		1	05
		152		0	01
		151		1	19
		147		3	09
		157		2	14
		157	1	1	16
		157	2	1	00
		169		3	08
		3	मोकलावास	168	
181				0	02
182				2	05
183				1	08
184				1	05
185				0	17
189				1	01
188				1	02
188	मिन			2	08
227				0	15
228				2	03
229				1	15
230				0	02
224				1	17
224	1			1	02
302				1	10
223				0	19
56				1	11
55		0	07		

तहसील: जोधपुर		जिला: जोधपुर		राज्य: राजस्थान	
क्र.सं.	गाँव का नाम	सर्वेक्षण नं.	हिस्सा क्रमांक	ROU क्षेत्रफल	
सं.				बिघा	बिस्वा
	1	2	3	4	
3	मोकलावास (जारी )	53	नाला सरकारी भूमि	0	07
		46	3	1	18
		46	4	1	10
		46	5 ; गौचर सरकारी भूमि	2	06
		339	1	0	18
		341		2	24
		342		1	05
		381		0	04
		381	1	2	01
		380		1	02
		380	1	0	02
		378		0	01
		379		2	19
		392		0	07
		391		1	06
		394		1	19
		398		1	14
		397		0	18
		435		0	10
		399		0	13
		402	नाला सरकारी भूमि	0	17
		404		0	01
		403	कार्ट ट्रैक सरकारी भूमि	0	15
		425		0	08
		426		2	12
4	जाखड़ो की ढाणी	265	सरकारी भूमि	0	02
		266	1	0	02
		264		2	09
		264	1	0	07
		270	सरकारी भूमि	2	01
5	नारवा खीचियान	263	कार्ट ट्रैक सरकारी भूमि	0	06
		5		1	14
		4	सरकारी भूमि	9	03
		6		0	01
		1	सरकारी भूमि	2	08
		22	सरकारी भूमि	3	03
		58		3	09
		57		1	10

तहसील: जोधपुर		जिला: जोधपुर		राज्य: राजस्थान	
क्र.स.	गाँव का नाम	सर्वेक्षण नं.	हिस्सा क्रमांक	ROU क्षेत्रफल	
				बिघा	बिस्वा
	1	2	3	4	
5	नाखा कीचियान (जारी )	56		3	14
		42	सरकारी भूमि	4	16
		43		1	01
		40		3	02
		95	रोड़ सरकारी भूमि (सा.नि.वि.)	0	04
		113		1	16
		100		3	02
		100	1	0	07
		100	2	0	16
		101		0	18
		102		3	18
6	इन्द्रोका	210		3	09
		212		5	01
		218		3	19
		219		3	12
		221		3	02
		200	सरकारी भूमि	3	07
		346	174	0	02
		366	201	0	02
		173		2	02
		173	1/1 ; कार्ट ट्रैक सरकारी भूमि	0	01
		173	1/2	5	05
		173	1/3	2	03
		172		1	17
		172	1 ; कार्ट ट्रैक सरकारी भूमि	0	01
		171	4	2	18
7	मण्गाई	7		0	07
		6	कार्ट ट्रैक सरकारी भूमि	0	01
		5	1	1	07
		5		4	01
		4	1	4	08
		246	3	1	19
		247	3	1	16
		248	3	1	17
		44		5	19
		46		1	14
		46	1	1	11
		46	2	1	10

तहसील: जोधपुर		जिला: जोधपुर		राज्य: राजस्थान	
क्र.म.	गाँव का नाम	सर्वेक्षण नं.	हिस्सा क्रमांक	ROU क्षेत्रफल	
स.				बिघा	बिस्वा
	1	2	3	4	
7	माणार्ह	46	3	0	15
	(जारी )	46	4 ; रोड़ सरकारी भूमि	0	02
		58	रोड़ सरकारी भूमि	0	03
		48	1	0	09
		48		1	12
		48	3 गै. मु. सड़क सा.नि.वि.	0	13
		49		6	19
		51		0	09
		59	कार्ट ट्रैक सरकारी भूमि	0	04
		50		1	13
		181	रास्ता सरकारी भूमि	0	04
		187		1	17

[ फा. सं. आर-31015/20/2001-ओ.आर-II ]

हरीश कुमार, अधर सचिव

**Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas**

New Delhi, the 10th July, 2002

S. O. 2350.— Whereas by a notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas S.O.number 3156 dated the thirteenth November, 2001, issued under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962, (50 of 1962), (hereinafter referred to as the said Act), published in the Gazette of India dated the 17/11/2001, the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the right of user in the land specified in the Schedule appended to that notification for the purpose of laying pipeline for the transport of petroleum products from Crude Oil Terminal (COT) at Mundra Port in the State of Gujarat to Bathinda in the State of Punjab through Mundra-Bathinda Crude Oil pipeline by Guru Gobind Singh Refineries Limited (A subsidiary of Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Limited);

And whereas, copies of the said notifications were made available to the public on 4/12/2001;

And whereas, the Competent Authority in pursuance of sub-section (1) of section 6 of the said Act has submitted his report to the Central Government;

And whereas, the Central Government, after considering the said report is satisfied that the right of user in the land specified in the Schedule appended to this notification should be acquired;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the said land specified in the Schedule appended to this notification is hereby acquired for laying the pipeline;

And further, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby directs that the right of user in the said land shall, instead of vesting in the Central Government, vest, in the Guru Gobind Singh Refineries Limited (A subsidiary of Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Limited) free from all encumbrances.

### SCHEDULE

Tehsil : Jodhpur		District : Jodhpur		State : Rajasthan	
Sr. No.	Name of Village	Survey No.	Part If Any	ROU Area	
	1	2	3	Biga	Biswa
1	ROHILA KALAN.	389		1	00
		390		0	18
		393		0	03
		392		1	12
		402		1	01
		403		1	00
		405		1	10
		406		0	01
		408		1	00
		409		0	02
		421		1	08
		426		1	03
		429		1	06
		431		0	02
		428		0	18
		432		1	03
		433		0	01
		376	1 Nala G.L.	1	02
		368		0	01
		363	Gouchar G.L.	2	04
		371		0	04
		372		0	01
		372	1; Aspalted Road G.L P.W.D.	0	03
		374		0	03
		375		2	10
		244	Nala G.L	0	05
		375	1	0	01
		235		0	01
		237		1	00
		238		1	04
		239		0	16
		240		1	01
2	ROHILA KHURD	87		0	10
		93		3	19
		92		0	01
		91		0	09

Tehsil : Jodhpur		District : Jodhpur		State : Rajasthan	
Sr.	Name of Village	Survey No.	Part If Any	ROU Area	
No.				Biga	Biswa
	1	2	3	4	
2	ROHILA KHURD (Contd.)	94	Cart Track G.L.	0	02
		96		1	04
		97		2	15
		99		0	06
		102		1	18
		103		0	01
		127	Cart Track G.L.	0	03
		159		5	09
		161		0	07
		160		2	00
		155		3	01
		150		1	05
		152		0	01
		151		1	19
		147		3	09
3	MOKLAWAS	157		2	14
		157	1	1	16
		157	2	1	00
		169		3	08
		168		1	12
		181		0	02
		182		2	05
		183		1	08
		184		1	05
		185		0	17
		189		1	01
		188		1	02
		188	Min	2	08
		227		0	15
		228		2	03
		229		1	15
		230		0	02
		224		1	17
		224	1	1	02
		302		1	10
		223		0	19
		56		1	11
		55		0	07

Tehsil : Jodhpur		District : Jodhpur		State : Rajasthan	
Sr. No.	Name of Village	Survey No.	Part If Any	ROU Area	
				Biga	Biswa
	1	2	3	4	
3	MOKLAWAS (Contd.)	53	Nala G.L.	0	07
		46	3	1	18
		46	4	1	10
		46	5 , Gouchar G.L.	2	06
		339	1	0	18
		341		2	04
		342		1	05
		381		0	04
		381	1	2	01
		380		1	02
		380	1	0	02
		378		0	01
		379		2	19
		392		0	07
		391		1	06
		394		1	19
		398		1	14
		397		0	18
		435		0	10
		399		0	13
		402	Nala G L	0	17
		404		0	01
		403	Cart Track G.L.	0	15
		425		0	08
		426		2	12
4	Jakharon ki Dhani	265	G.L.	0	02
		266	1	0	02
		264		2	09
		264	1	0	07
		270	G.L.	2	01
5	Narwa Khichiyan	263	Cart Track G.L.	0	06
		5		1	14
		4	G.L.	9	03
		6		0	01
		1	G.L.	2	08
		22	G.L.	3	03
		58		3	09
		57		1	10

Tehsil : Jodhpur		District : Jodhpur		State : Rajasthan	
Sr.	Name of Village	Survey No.	Part If Any	ROU Area	
No.				Biga	Biswa
	1	2	3	4	
5	NARWA	56		3	14
	KHICHIYAN	42	G.L.	4	16
	(Contd.)	43		1	01
		40		3	02
		95	Road G.L. P.W.D.	0	04
		113		1	16
		100		3	02
		100	1	0	07
		100	2	0	16
		101		0	18
		102		3	18
6	INDROKA	210		3	09
		212		5	01
		218		3	19
		219		3	12
		221		3	02
		200	G.L.	3	07
		346	174	0	02
		366	201	0	02
		173		2	02
		173	1/1 Cart track G.L.	0	01
		173	1/2	5	05
		173	1/3	2	03
		172		1	17
		172	1 ; Cart Track G.L.	0	01
		171	4	2	18
7	MANAI	7		0	07
		6	Cart Track G.L.	0	01
		5	1	1	07
		5		4	01
		4	1	4	08
		246	3	1	19
		247	3	1	16
		248	3	1	17
		44		5	19
		46		1	14
		46	1	1	11
		46	2	1	10



Tehsil : Jodhpur		District : Jodhpur		State : Rajasthan	
r.	Name of Village	Survey No	Part If Any	ROU Area	
No.				Biga	Biswa
	1	2	3	4	
7	MANAI	46	3	0	15
	(Contd.)	46	4 Road G.L.	0	02
		58	Road G.L.	0	03
		48	1	0	09
		48		1	12
		48	3 Road G.L. P.W.D.	0	13
		49		6	19
		51		0	09
		59	Cart Track G.L.	0	04
		50		1	13
		181	Cart Track G.L.	0	04
		187		1	17

[No. R-31015/20/2001-O.R.-II]  
HARISH KUMAR, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 11 जुलाई, 2002

का. आ. 2351.— केन्द्रीय सरकार को लोकहित में यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि गुजरात राज्य में मुन्द्रा पत्तनस्थित अपरिष्कृत तेल संस्थापन (सी.ओ.टी.) से पंजाब राज्य में भटिंडा तक मुन्द्रा-भटिंडा पाइपलाइन से होकर अपरिष्कृत तेल के परिवहन के लिए एक पाइपलाइन गुरु गोबिन्द सिंह रिफाइनरीज लिमिटेड (हिन्दुस्तान पेट्रोलियम कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड की समनुषंगी) द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार को उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि उस भूमि में जिसके भीतर उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाई जाने का प्रस्ताव है और जो इस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित है, उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाए;

अतः अब केन्द्रीय सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उसमें उपयोग के अधिकार को अर्जित करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा करती है ;

कोई व्यक्ति, जो उक्त अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में हितबद्ध है, उस तारीख से, जिसको भारत के राजपत्र में यथाप्रकाशित उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन जारी अधिसूचना की प्रतियां साधारण जनता को उपलब्ध करा दी जाती हैं, इक्कीस दिन के भीतर, भूमि के भीतर पाइपलाइन बिछाने के अधिकार के अर्जन के संबंध में श्री डी० के० पारेख, सक्षम प्राधिकारी, मुन्द्रा-भटिंडा अपरिष्कृत तेल पाइपलाइन, गुरु गोबिन्द सिंह रिफाइनरीज लिमिटेड (हिन्दुस्तान पेट्रोलियम कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड की समनुषंगी) पो. ब. सं. 43, यूनिट-2 मु. पो. खारी रोहर, तहसील गोंधीधाम, गुजरात को लिखित रूप में आक्षेप भेज सकेगा ।

## अनुसूची

तहसील :- अन्जार

जिला :- कच्छ

राज्य :- गुजरात

गाँव का नाम	सर्वे संख्या	भाग यदि है तो	क्षेत्रफल		
			हेक्टर	आर	सेन्टी आर
1	2	3	4		
भीमासर	622		0	23	36
	623	पैकी	0	18	25
	625/2		0	00	56
	624		0	29	23
	626		0	00	17
	627	पैकी	0	35	86
	628	पैकी	1	01	92
	-	मेटल रोड	0	01	90
	ट्रान्स 785	पैकी	0	15	70
	663		0	37	88
	671		0	00	35
	670		0	59	65
	664		0	30	37
	665	पैकी	0	28	55
	666		0	05	87
	ट्रान्स 785	पैकी	0	14	41
	-	कार्ट ट्रैक	0	01	62
	715		0	39	25
	717		0	45	98
	-	नाला	0	04	46
	742		0	43	12
	741		0	23	06
	740	पैकी	0	15	04
	732		0	59	69
	733		0	00	39
	737		0	41	29

तहसील :- अन्जार

जिला :- पच्छ

गन्ज :- गुजरात

गाँव का नाम	सर्वे सँख्या	भाग यदि है तो	क्षेत्रफल		
			हेक्टर	आर	मेट्रा आर
1	2	3	4		
भीमासर (जारी...)	736	पैकी	0	14	11
	-	नाला	0	06	38
	777		0	39	02
	776	पैकी	0	39	28
	ट्रार्क्स 785	पैकी	0	09	41
	35		0	33	57
	36		0	38	44
	40/1		0	35	92
	39		0	33	07
	ट्रार्क्स 785	पैकी	0	36	98
	17	पैकी	0	35	19
	17	पैकी कार्ट ट्रैक	0	00	90
	787		0	18	67
	ट्रार्क्स 785	पैकी	0	07	67
	-	नाला	0	01	95
	ट्रार्क्स 785	पैकी	0	14	51
	79	पैकी	0	90	06
	-	नाला	0	01	55
	81		0	49	04
	80	पैकी	0	04	33
	82		0	24	88
	91		0	47	88
	90		0	10	82
	89		0	14	98
	-	नाला	0	15	21
	93		0	29	57
	94		0	00	39
	95		0	42	48

तहसील :- अन्जार

जिला :- कच्छ

राज्य :- गुजरात

गाँव का नाम	सर्वे मूँख्या	भाग यदि है तो	क्षेत्रफल		
			हेक्टर	आर	मेन्टी आर
1	2	3	4		
भीमासर (जारी...)	98/2		0	28	08
	ट्रार्बम 785	पेकी	0	07	61
	101		0	06	69
	100		0	23	96
	99		0	58	37
पसुडा	305		0	23	36
	306		0	10	66
	308		0	34	43
	310/2		0	05	07
	307		0	00	58
	334		0	49	05
	332		0	31	77
	335		0	11	71
	336	पेकी	0	21	71
	337		0	35	09
	338/1		0	26	49
	342	पेकी	0	29	71
	328		0	00	56
	327/2	पेकी	0	12	65
	327/1		0	20	44
	346		0	06	55
	326		0	10	68
	325		0	11	36
	348		0	44	55
	349		0	25	07
	322		0	13	88
	352		0	10	84
	368/1		0	04	38
	368/2		0	14	96
	371/3		0	11	67

तहसील :- अन्जार

जिला :- कच्छ

राज्य :- गुजरात

गाँव का नाम	सर्वे संख्या	भाग यदि है तो	क्षेत्रफल		
			हेक्टर	आर	सेन्टी आर
1	2	3	4		
पसुडा (जारी...)	369/2		0	00	22
	366	पेकी	0	36	48
	363	पेकी	0	36	70
	380	पेकी गौचर	1	21	38
	380	पेकी कार्ट ट्रैक	0	06	81
	30		0	21	73
	31		0	22	63
	34		0	40	62
	33		0	43	05

[ फा. सं. आर-31015/47/2001-ओ.आर-II ]

हरीश कुमार, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 11th July, 2002

S. O. 2351.— Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transportation of crude oil from Crude Oil Terminal (COT) at Mundra Port in the State of Gujarat to Bathinda in the State of Punjab through Mundra -Bathinda pipeline, a pipeline should be laid by Guru Gobind Singh Refineries Limited (A subsidiary of Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Limited);

And whereas it appears to the Central Government that for the purpose of laying the said pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user (ROU) in the land under which the said pipeline is proposed to be laid, and which is described in the Schedule annexed to this notification;

Now, therefore in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Any person interested in the land described in the said Schedule may, within twenty- one days from the date on which the copies of the notification issued under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the said Act, as published in the Gazette of India, are made available to the general public, object in writing to the laying of the pipeline under the land to Shri D.K.PAREKH, Competent Authority, Mundra-Bathinda Crude Oil Pipeline, Guru Gobind Singh Refineries Limited (A subsidiary of Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Limited), P.B.No.43, Unit 2, HPCL., At & PO Khari Rohar, Tal. Gandhidham, Gujarat.

**SCHEDULE****Taluka: Anjar****District: Kutch****State: Gujarat**

Name of Village	Survey No.	Part if Any	ROU Area		
			Ha.	Ar.	Sq.mt
1	2	3	4		
<b>Bhimasar</b>	622		0	23	36
	623	P	0	18	25
	625/2		0	00	56
	624		0	29	23
	626		0	00	17
	627	P	0	35	86
	628	P	1	01	92
	-	Metal Road	0	01	90
	Trowers 785	P	0	15	70
	663		0	37	88
	671		0	00	35
	670		0	59	65
	664		0	30	37
	665	P	0	28	55
	666		0	05	87
	Trowers 785	P	0	14	41
	-	Cart Track	0	01	62
	715		0	39	25
	717		0	45	98
	-	Nala	0	04	46
	742		0	43	12
	741		0	23	06
	740	P	0	15	04
	732		0	59	69
	733		0	00	39
	737		0	41	29
	736	P	0	14	11
	-	Stream	0	06	38
	777		0	39	02

Taluka: Anjar

District: Kutch

State: Gujarat

Name of Village	Survey No.	Part if Any	ROU Area		
			Ha.	Ar.	Sq.mt
1	2	3	4		
Bhimasar (Contd...)	776	P	0	39	28
	Trowers 785	P	0	09	41
	35		0	33	57
	36		0	38	44
	40/1		0	35	92
	39		0	33	07
	Trowers 785	P	0	36	98
	17	P	0	35	19
	17	P Cart Track	0	00	90
	787		0	18	67
	Trowers 785	P	0	07	67
	-	Stream	0	01	95
	Trowers 785	P	0	14	51
	79	P	0	90	06
	-	Stream	0	01	55
	81		0	49	04
	80	P	0	04	33
	82		0	24	88
	91		0	47	88
	90		0	10	82
	89		0	14	98
	-	Nala	0	15	21
	93		0	29	57
	94		0	00	39
	95		0	42	48
	98/2		0	28	08
	Trowers 785	P	0	07	61
	101		0	06	69

Taluka: Anjar

District: Kutch

State: Gujarat

Name of Village	Survey No.	Part if Any	ROU Area		
			Ha.	Ar.	Sq.mt
1	2	3 *	4		
Bhimasar (Contd...)	100		0	23	96
	99		0	58	37
Pasuda	305		0	23	36
	306		0	10	66
	308		0	34	43
	310/2		0	05	07
	307		0	00	58
	334		0	49	05
	332		0	31	77
	335		0	11	71
	336	P	0	21	71
	337		0	35	09
	338/1		0	26	49
	342	P	0	29	71
	328		0	00	56
	327/2	P	0	12	65
	327/1		0	20	44
	346		0	06	55
	326		0	10	68
	325		0	11	36
	348		0	44	55
	349		0	25	07
	322		0	13	88
	352		0	10	84
	368/1		0	04	38
	368/2		0	14	96
	371/3		0	11	67
	369/2		0	00	22
	366	P	0	36	48
	363	P	0	36	70
	380	P Gauchar	1	21	38
	380	P Cart Track	0	06	81



Taluka: Anjar

District: Kutch

State: Gujarat

Name of Village	Survey No.	Part if Any	ROU Area		
			Ha.	Ar.	Sq.mt
1	2	3	4		
Pasuda (Contd...)	30		0	21	73
	31		0	22	63
	34		0	40	62
	33		0	43	05

[No R-31015/47/2001-OR-II]  
HARISH KUMAR, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 11 जुलाई, '002

का. आ. 2352.— केन्द्रीय सरकार को लोकहित में यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि गुजरात राज्य में मुन्द्रा पत्तनस्थित अपरिष्कृत तेल संस्थापन (अ.ते.सं.) से पंजाब राज्य में भटिंडा तक मुन्द्रा-भटिंडा पाइपलाइन से होकर अपरिष्कृत तेल के परिवहन के लिए एक पाइपलाइन गुरु गोबिन्द सिंह रिफाइनरीज लिमिटेड (हिन्दुस्तान पेट्रोलियम कॉरपोरेशन लिमिटेड की समनुषंगी) द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार को उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि उक्त भूमि में, जिसके भीतर उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाए जाने का प्रस्ताव है और जो इस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित है, उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाए;

अतः अब केन्द्रीय सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उसमें उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा करती है ;

कोई व्यक्ति, जो उक्त अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में हितवद्ध है उस तारीख से, जिसको भारत के राजपत्र में यथाप्रकाशित इस अधिनियम की प्रतियां साधारण जनता को उपलब्ध करा दी जाती हैं, इक्कीस दिन के भीतर, भूमि के भीतर पाइपलाइन बिछाने के अधिकार के अर्जन के संबंध में श्री डी० के० पारेख, सक्षम प्राधिकारी, मुन्द्रा-भटिंडा अपरिष्कृत तेल पाइपलाइन, गुरु गोबिन्द सिंह रिफाइनरीज लिमिटेड (हिन्दुस्तान पेट्रोलियम कॉरपोरेशन लिमिटेड की समनुषंगी) पी. बी. सं. 43-क, यूनिट-2 मु. पो., एच.पी.सी.एल., खारी रोहर, गाँधीधाम, गुजरात राज्य को लिखित रूप में आक्षेप भेज सकेगा ।

## अनुमृची

तहसील :- अन्जार

जिला :- कच्छ

राज्य :- गुजरात

गाँव का नाम	सर्वे सँख्या	भाग यदि है तो	क्षेत्रफल		
			हेक्टर	आर	सन्टी आर
1	2	3	4		
चन्द्राडा	द्वारस 600	पैकी	0	33	25
	249		0	34	42
	द्वारस 600	पैकी	0	58	89
	251/1		0	17	52
	251/2		0	34	10
	द्वारस 600	पैकी	0	47	81
	254		0	09	82
	द्वारस 600		0	88	96
	268		0	07	35
	-	नाला	0	02	28
	267		0	01	31
	-	नाला	0	00	44
	266		0	20	05
	द्वारस 600	पैकी	0	11	77
	271		0	26	61
	272/1	पैकी	0	22	55
	द्वारस 600	पैकी	0	00	28
	-	कार्ट ट्रैक	0	00	19
	द्वारस 600	पैकी	0	28	65
	273		0	39	34
	द्वारस 600	पैकी	0	34	01
	279/1		0	35	85
	279/2		0	07	13
	279/3	पैकी	0	11	65
	279/3	पैकी	0	01	29
	278		0	11	15
	280		0	00	19
	277		0	22	61
	276/1-B		0	46	21
	282		0	25	22
	283		0	44	57

तहसील :- अन्जारा

जिला :- कच्छ

गज्य :- गुजरात

गाँव का नाम	सर्वे संख्या	भाग यदि है तो	क्षेत्रफल		
			हेक्टर	आर	मैन्टी आर
1	2	3	4		
चन्द्राडा (जागी...)	-	नदी	0	32	46
	-	कार्ट ट्रैक	0	00	35
	ट्रान्स 600	पैकी	0	20	03
	436		0	17	34
	-	नाला	0	01	97
	422		0	35	18
	-	कार्ट ट्रैक	0	03	00
	435/4		0	21	22
	434/1		0	20	89
	434/3		0	12	95
	-	कार्ट ट्रैक	0	02	58
	444/2		0	34	98
	444/4		0	28	39
	444/3		0	22	14
	-	कार्ट ट्रैक	0	06	08
	488		0	00	75
	487/1		0	19	18
	487/2		0	23	94
	485/1		0	19	29
	485/2		0	04	00
	-	नाला	0	08	80
	478	पैकी	0	41	38
	477		0	19	74
	475/1		0	23	89
	476		0	21	57
	470		0	15	40
	469		0	17	41
	468		0	21	77
	455	पैकी	0	29	39
	457		0	07	52

तहसील अन्जार

जिला :- कच्छ

राज्य :- गुजरात

गाँव का नाम	सर्वे सँख्या	भाग यदि है तो	क्षेत्रफल		
			हेक्टर	आर	मैन्टी आर
1	2	3	4		
चन्द्राडा (जारी...)	456	.	0	24	48
अन्जार	द्वारस 984	पैकी	0	04	80
	158/2		0	45	52
	द्वारस 984	पैकी	0	14	19
	141		0	31	54
	142		0	39	41
	द्वारस 984	पैकी	1	48	50
	252		0	13	53
	द्वारस 984	पैकी	0	13	55
	253	पैकी	0	24	21
	255	पैकी	0	76	98
	द्वारस 984	पैकी	0	00	65
	260	पैकी	0	27	29
	266	पैकी	1	12	08
	267	पैकी	0	27	36
	270		0	32	54
	271		0	32	85
	302		0	47	76
	301		0	32	75
	300		0	32	55
	299	पैकी	0	07	20
	306	पैकी	0	17	33
	307		0	45	60
	308/1		0	30	94
	308/3		0	35	54
	375		0	27	76
	374	पैकी	0	00	79
	द्वारस 984	पैकी	0	01	72

पट्टी :- अन्जार

जिला :- कच्छ

गज्य :- गुजरात

गोंय का नाम	सर्वे संख्या	भाग यदि है तो	क्षेत्रफल		
			हेक्टर	आर	सेन्टी आर
1	2	3	4		
अन्जार	-	गल्येकी गुली जमीन	0	64	48
(जारी...)	388/1		0	09	16
	388/2		0	13	60
	418		0	00	51
	421		0	10	30
	417		0	47	27
	422	पेकी	0	98	62
	423		0	47	76
	द्वार्वम 984	पेकी	0	01	86
	451		0	26	31
	450	पेकी	0	94	04
	449		0	41	03
	448/2		0	30	52
	447/3		0	19	76
	447/4		0	09	33
	द्वार्वम 984	पेकी	0	38	04
	-	नाला	0	02	57
	444/2		0	05	59
	443/1		0	13	61
	443/2		0	26	44
	442		0	28	77
	-	कार्टे ट्रैक	0	12	15
	494/2		0	14	67
	494/1		0	16	51
	495		0	88	89
	द्वार्वम 984	पेकी	0	18	61

तहसील :- अन्जार

जिला :- कच्छ

राज्य :- गुजरात

गाँव का नाम	सर्वे संख्या	माग यदि है तो	क्षेत्रफल		
			हेक्टर	आर	मैन्टी आर
1	2	3	4		
अन्जार (जारी...)	497		0	23	47
	498/1		0	74	62
	499		0	28	44

[फा. सं. आर-31015/47/2001-ओ.आर-II]

हरीश कुमार, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 11th July, 2002

S. O. 2352.— Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transportation of crude oil from Crude Oil Terminal (COT) at Mundra Port in the State of Gujarat to Bathinda in the State of Punjab through Mundra -Bathinda pipeline, a pipeline should be laid by Guru Gobind Singh Refineries Limited (A subsidiary of Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Limited);

And whereas it appears to the Central Government that for the purpose of laying the said pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user (ROU) in the land under which the said pipeline is proposed to be laid, and which is described in the Schedule annexed to this notification;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Any person interested in the land described in the said Schedule may, within twenty- one days from the date on which the copies of the notification issued under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the said Act, as published in the Gazette of India, are made available to the general public, object in writing to the laying of the pipeline under the land to Shri D.K.PAREKH, Competent Authority, Mundra-Bathinda Crude Oil Pipeline, Guru Gobind Singh Refineries Limited (A subsidiary of Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Limited), P.B.No.43, Unit 2, HPCL., At & PO Khari Rohar, Tal. Gandhidham, Gujarat.

## SCHEDULE

Taluka :- Anjar

District :- Kutch

State :- Gujarat

Name of Village	Survey No	Part if Any	ROU Area		
			Ha.	Ar.	Sq.mt.
1	2	3	4		
Chandroda	Towers 600	P	0	33	25
	249	P	0	34	42
	Towers 600	P	0	58	89
	251/1		0	17	52
	251/2		0	34	10
	Towers 600	P	0	47	81
	254		0	09	82
	Towers 600		0	88	96
	268		0	07	35
	-	Nala	0	02	28
	267		0	01	31
	-	Nala	0	00	44
	266		0	20	05
	Towers 600	P	0	11	77
	271		0	26	61
	272/1	P	0	22	55
	Towers 600	P	0	00	28
	-	Cart Track	0	00	19
	Towers 600	P	0	28	65
	273		0	39	34
	Towers 600	P	0	34	01
	279/1		0	35	85
	279/2		0	07	13
	279/3	P	0	11	65
	279/3	P	0	01	29
	278		0	11	15
	280		0	00	19
	277		0	22	61
	276/1-B		0	46	21
	282		0	25	22
	283		0	44	57

Taluka :- Anjar

District :- Kutch

State :- Gujarat

Name of Village	Survey No	Part if Any	ROU Area		
			Ha.	Ar.	Sq.mt.
1	2	3	4		
Chandroda (Contd.)	-	River	0	32	46
	-	Cart Track	0	00	35
	Trowers 600	P	0	20	03
	436		0	17	34
	-	Nala	0	01	97
	422		0	35	18
	-	Cart Track	0	03	00
	435/4		0	21	22
	434/1		0	20	89
	434/3		0	12	95
	-	Cart Track	0	02	58
	444/2		0	34	98
	444/4		0	28	39
	444/3		0	22	14
	-	Cart Track	0	06	08
	488		0	00	75
	487/1		0	19	18
	487/2		0	23	94
	485/1		0	19	29
	485/2		0	04	00
	-	Nala	0	08	80
	478	P	0	41	38
	477		0	19	74
	475/1		0	23	89
	476		0	21	57
	470		0	15	40
	469		0	17	41
	468		0	21	77
	455	P	0	29	39
	457		0	07	52



Taluka :- Anjar

District :- Kutch

State :- Gujarat

Name of Village	Survey No	Part if Any	ROU Area		
			Ha.	Ar.	Sq.mt.
1	2	3	4		
Chandroda (Contd.)	456		0	24	48
Anjar	Trowers 984	P	0	04	80
	158/2		0	45	52
	Trowers 984	P	0	14	19
	141		0	31	54
	142		0	39	41
	Trowers 984	P	1	48	50
	252		0	13	53
	Trowers 984	P	0	13	55
	253	P	0	24	21
	255	P	0	76	98
	Trowers 984	P	0	00	65
	260	P	0	27	29
	266	P	1	12	08
	267	P	0	27	36
	270		0	32	54
	271		0	32	85
	302		0	47	76
	301		0	32	75
	300		0	32	55
	299	P	0	07	20
	306	P	0	17	33
	307		0	45	60
	308/1		0	30	94
	308/3		0	35	54
	375		0	27	76
	374	P	0	00	79
	Trowers 984	P	0	01	72

Taluka :- Anjar

District :- Kutch

State :- Gujarat

Name of Village	Survey No	Part if Any	ROU Area		
			Ha.	Ar.	Sq.mt.
1	2	3	4		
Anjar (Contd.)	-	Railway Open Land	0	64	48
	388/1		0	09	16
	388/2		0	13	60
	418		0	00	51
	421		0	10	30
	417		0	47	27
	422	P	0	98	62
	423		0	47	76
	Towers 984	P	0	01	86
	451		0	26	31
	450	P	0	94	04
	449		0	41	03
	448/2		0	30	52
	447/3		0	19	76
	447/4		0	09	33
	Towers 984	P	0	38	04
	-	Nala	0	02	57
	444/2		0	05	59
	443/1		0	13	61
	443/2		0	26	44
	442		0	28	77
	-	Cart Track	0	12	15
	494/2		0	14	67
	494/1		0	16	51
	495		0	88	89
	Towers 984	P	0	18	61

Taluka :- Anjar

District :- Kutch

State :- Gujarat

Name of Village	Survey No	Part if Any	ROU Area		
			Ha.	Ar.	Sq.mt.
1	2	3	4		
Anjar (Contd.)	497		0	23	47
	498/1		0	74	62
	499		0	28	44

[No. R-31015/47/2001-O.R.-II]  
HARISH KUMAR, Under Secy

नई दिल्ली, 11 जुलाई, 2002

का. आ. 2353.— केन्द्रीय सरकार को लोकहित में यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि गुजरात राज्य में मुन्द्रा पत्तनस्थित अपरिष्कृत तेल संस्थापन (सी.ओ.टी.) से पंजाब राज्य में भटिंडा तक मुन्द्रा-भटिंडा पाइपलाइन से होकर अपरिष्कृत तेल के परिवहन के लिए एक पाइपलाइन गुरु गोबिन्द सिंह रिफाइनरीज लिमिटेड (हिन्दुस्तान पेट्रोलियम कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड की समनुषंगी) द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार को उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए, यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि उस भूमि में, जिसके भीतर उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाए जाने का प्रस्ताव है और जो इस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित है, उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाए ;

अतः अब केन्द्रीय सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उस भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा करती है ;

कोई व्यक्ति, जो उक्त अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में हितबद्ध है उस तारीख से, जिसको भारत के राजपत्र में यथाप्रकाशित इस अधिसूचना की प्रतियां साधारण जनता को उपलब्ध करा दी जाती है, इक्कीस दिन के भीतर, उसमें उपयोग के या भूमि के भीतर पाइपलाइन बिछाने के अधिकार के अर्जन के संबंध में श्री डी. के. पारेख, सक्षम प्राधिकारी, मुन्द्रा-भटिंडा अपरिष्कृत तेल पाइपलाइन, गुरु गोबिन्द सिंह रिफाइनरीज लिमिटेड (हिन्दुस्तान पेट्रोलियम कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड की समनुषंगी), डा. घ. सं-43, यूनिट-2, एच. पी. सी. एल., मु. पो. खारी रोहर, तालुका गांधीधाम, गुजरात राज्य को लिखित रूप में आक्षेप भेज सकेगा ।

## अनुसूची

तालुका:- सांतेलपुर

जिला :- पाटण

राज्य :- गुजरात

गौव का नाम	(खसरा) सर्वेक्षण क्रमांक	हिस्सा क्रमांक	क्षेत्रफल		
			हेक्टर	आर	मन्टी आर
1	2	3	4		
(1) सांतेलपुर	151	पेकी कार्ट ट्रैक	0	29	30
	152		0	40	99
	153		0	07	98
	154		0	18	73
	179		0	40	50
	198		0	01	49
	198		0	24	90
	204		0	15	42
	203		0	01	05
	206		0	30	25
	207		0	08	56
	208		0	28	62
	209		0	13	05
	210		0	27	34
	211		0	21	08
	190		0	56	16
	189		0	09	08
	219		0	30	01
(2) पर	838		0	25	09
	833/1		0	38	02
	842		0	03	37
	843		0	15	26
	844		0	15	91
	845		0	07	93
	825		0	42	25
	824		0	11	09
	823		0	37	40
	819		0	33	12
	812		0	00	10
	813/1		0	16	41
	815		0	44	81
	816		0	00	34
	814/1		0	36	23
	814/2		0	00	09
	794		0	16	98

तालुका:- सांतलपुर

जिला :- पाटण

राज्य :- गुजरात

गौंव का नाम	(खसरा) सर्वेक्षण क्रमांक	हिस्सा क्रमांक	क्षेत्रफल		
			हेक्टर	आर	सेन्टी आर
1	2	3	4		
(2) पर (जारी)	793	पेकी	0	19	36
	792		0	18	47
	791		0	18	57
	645		0	75	58
	646		0	16	72
	647		0	76	14
	648		0	38	95
	649		0	42	21
	656		0	20	99
	657		0	35	41
	658	पेकी	0	54	52
	663/1		0	19	11
	663/2		0	21	76
	664		0	03	61
	—		0	09	36
	669		0	48	44
	670		0	24	76
	676		0	24	37
	675		0	17	01
	674		0	19	43
	673	कार्ट ट्रैक	0	04	55
	484		0	21	97
	485		0	14	88
	482		0	09	59
	486		0	12	14
	481		0	08	12
	478		0	00	74
	487		0	22	04
	488		0	14	91
	477/1		0	22	97
	474		0	22	87
	490		0	03	73
	473		0	14	06
	472		0	11	94
	470		0	34	44
	467		0	33	48
	464		0	20	04

तालुका:- सांतलपुर

जिला :- पाटण

राज्य :- गुजरात

गौव का नाम	(खसरा) सर्वेक्षण क्रमांक	हिस्सा क्रमांक	क्षेत्रफल		
			हेक्टर	आर	सेन्टी आर
1	2	3	4		
(2) पर (जारी)	465	पैकी	0	18	98
	463		0	36	16
	459		0	33	97
	435		0	32	09
(3) छानसरा	48	पैकी	0	17	76
	47		0	00	10
	49		0	29	21
	50		0	11	78
	51		0	65	03
	53		0	46	29
	---		0	02	98
	61		0	44	34
	61		0	01	10
	63		0	00	10
	65		0	65	09
	66		0	12	84
	64		0	51	43
	74		0	34	82
	81		0	02	98
	82		0	36	15
	85		0	46	75
	84		0	18	15
	---		0	02	68
	108		0	21	80
	88		0	11	98
	107		0	32	43
	---		0	02	51
	118		0	16	15
	119		0	40	66
	116		0	09	14
	120		0	20	22
	164		0	28	42
	165		0	11	07
	166		0	28	62
	186		0	20	98
	187		0	11	72

तालुका:- सांतलपुर

जिला :- पाटण

राज्य :- गुजरात

गौव का नाम	(खसरा) सर्वेक्षण क्रमांक	हिस्सा क्रमांक	क्षेत्रफल		
			हेक्टर	आर	सेन्टी आर
1	2	3	4		
(3) छानसरा (जरी)	188	पेकी	0	22	63
	190		0	21	98
	189		0	13	12
	191		0	01	24
	192		0	23	07
	193		0	28	37
	---	कार्ट ट्रैक	0	00	13
	194	पेकी	0	46	86
	194	पेकी कार्ट ट्रैक	0	01	10
	200	पेकी	0	36	10
	200	पेकी कार्ट ट्रैक	0	04	77
	207	पेकी	0	43	50
	207	पेकी कार्ट ट्रैक	0	01	10
	206		0	46	54
	45	पेकी	0	14	05
(4) दईगावडा	32	पेकी	0	26	49
	32	पेकी कार्ट ट्रैक	0	01	10
	19	पेकी	0	73	94
	17		0	20	36
	20	पेकी	0	78	61
	13		0	19	92
	12		0	28	96
	11		0	21	74
	28		0	71	45
	29		0	01	62
	36		0	00	48
	34		0	46	65
	---	कार्ट ट्रैक	0	03	38
	82/1		0	36	65
	82/2		0	15	59
	83		0	38	11
	84	कार्ट ट्रैक	0	01	34
	90		0	29	90
	89		0	31	68
	103	पेकी	0	34	16
	103	पेकी कार्ट ट्रैक	0	48	83
	103		0	01	10

तालुका:- सांतलपुर

जिला :- पाटण

राज्य :- गुजरात

गाँव का नाम	(खसरा) सर्वेक्षण क्रमांक	हिस्सा क्रमांक	क्षेत्रफल		
			हेक्टर	आर	सेन्टी आर
1	2	3	4		
(4) दईगामडा (जारी)	103	पैकी कार्ट ट्रैक	0	01	10
	103	पैकी कार्ट ट्रैक	0	01	10
	104	पैकी	0	49	08
	126	पैकी	0	38	51
	---	कार्ट ट्रैक	0	05	81
	127		0	06	26
	125		0	14	97
	---	कार्ट ट्रैक	0	02	79
	124		0	34	22
	119		0	16	54
	123		0	10	47
	120		0	50	61
	121		0	07	44
(5) बामरोली	196		0	02	53
	182		0	46	40
	180	पैकी	0	17	12
	174		0	27	86
	175		0	34	05
	172	पैकी	0	36	64
	171/1		0	05	04
	148		0	17	62
	150		0	18	74
	152		0	49	09
	153		0	41	79
	154		0	19	53
	---	कार्ट ट्रैक	0	05	63
	128		0	33	83
	127		0	10	21
	126		0	24	46
	125		0	29	53
	518	पैकी	1	20	66
	30	पैकी	0	29	80
	30	पैकी कार्ट ट्रैक	0	01	10
	29/1		0	10	07
	29/2		0	14	52
	28		0	18	77



तालुका:- सातलपुर

जिला :- पाटण

राज्य :- गुजरात

गाँव का नाम	(खसरा) सर्वेक्षण क्रमांक	हिस्सा क्रमांक	क्षेत्रफल		
			हेक्टर	आर	मन्दी आर
1	2	3	4		
(5) बामरोली (जारी)	27		0	27	58
	25		0	12	57
	22		0	11	41
	21		0	14	88
	20		0	36	16
	18		0	30	58
(6) डाभी	44/1		0	25	23
	44/2		0	12	56
(7) उनरोट	186		0	38	05
	184		0	27	65
	181		0	02	86
	179		0	28	02
	178		0	41	98
	177		0	12	80
	154		0	28	92
	162		0	32	64
	161	पैकी	0	11	28
	161	पैकी कार्ट ट्रैक	0	01	10
	163		0	22	95
	164		0	39	18
	165		0	38	34
	167		0	17	39
	14	पैकी	1	77	06
	14	पैकी कार्ट ट्रैक	0	01	10
	16/2		0	36	11
	29	पैकी	0	24	70
	29	पैकी कार्ट ट्रैक	0	01	10
	28	पैकी	0	09	73
	28	पैकी कार्ट ट्रैक	0	01	10
	30		0	32	07
	37		0	21	32
	38	पैकी	0	23	99
	38	पैकी कार्ट ट्रैक	0	11	44
	40		0	37	95
	42		0	44	68
	41		0	21	57

तालुका:- सांतलपुर

जिला :- पाटण

राज्य :- गुजरात

गौंव का नाम	(खसरा) सर्वेक्षण क्रमांक	हिस्सा क्रमांक	क्षेत्रफल		
			हेक्टर	आर	सेन्टी आर
1	2	3	4		
(8) जारुसा	146		0	48	19
	149	पैकी	0	23	01
	144/2		0	00	36
	150		0	36	49
	143	पैकी	0	01	60
	143	पैकी कार्ट ट्रैक	0	00	55
	142	पैकी कार्ट ट्रैक	0	00	55
	142	पैकी	0	28	38
	151		0	31	05
	53	पैकी	3	93	90
	53	पैकी कार्ट ट्रैक	0	01	10
	53	पैकी कार्ट ट्रैक	0	01	10
	53	पैकी कार्ट ट्रैक	0	01	10
	53	पैकी कार्ट ट्रैक	0	01	10
	304		0	16	47
	53	पैकी कार्ट ट्रैक	0	01	10
	306	पैकी	0	59	02
	303/1		0	22	26
	303/2		0	30	97
	302	पैकी कार्ट ट्रैक	0	01	10
	302	पैकी	0	30	10
	300		0	02	90
	301		0	11	42
	298		0	28	85
	297	पैकी	0	36	54
(9) झकडा	581		0	20	99
	582		0	15	33
	583		0	30	62
	585	पैकी	0	29	19
	591		0	24	08
	592		0	26	28
	593		0	17	22
	594		0	03	27
	---	कार्ट ट्रैक	0	02	50
	610		0	26	24
	607	पैकी	0	32	13

तालुका:- सांतलपुर

जिला :- पाटण

राज्य :- गुजरात

गाँव का नाम	(खसरा) सर्वेक्षण क्रमांक	हिस्सा क्रमांक	क्षेत्रफल		
			हेक्टर	आर	सेन्टी आर
1	2	3	4		
(9) झोकडा (जारी)	627	पैकी	0	34	08
	628		0	41	01
	7		0	12	12
	---	कार्ट ट्रैक	0	02	43
	6		0	31	30
	5		0	13	97
	4	पैकी	0	09	36
	23		0	01	15
	24		0	30	39
	---	कार्ट ट्रैक	0	03	55
	87		0	18	10
	86		0	25	45
	85	कार्ट ट्रैक	0	35	01
	---		0	02	48
	108		0	28	48
	---	कार्ट ट्रैक	0	05	72
	107		0	53	13
	100		0	05	40
	106	कार्ट ट्रैक	0	17	68
	105		0	15	37
	101		0	14	27
	102	कार्ट ट्रैक	0	24	30
	---		0	06	97
	270		0	24	61
	268	पैकी	0	35	98
	266		0	22	80
	264		0	18	40
	261	कार्ट ट्रैक	0	29	17
	263		0	00	10
	262		0	47	39
	262	पैकी	0	01	10
	254		0	18	05
	255		0	02	65
	253	पैकी	0	46	95
	251		0	15	13
	250		0	44	50

तालुका:- सांतलपुर

जिला :- पाटण

राज्य :- गुजरात

गाँव का नाम	(खसरा) सर्वेक्षण क्रमांक	हिस्सा क्रमांक	क्षेत्रफल		
			हेक्टर	आर	सेन्टी आर
1	2	3	4		
(9) झकडा (जारी)	249	पेकी	0	00	10
	245		0	29	91
	246		0	26	94
	238		0	48	51
	---	कार्ट ट्रैक	0	00	13

[फा. सं. आर-31015/9/2002-ओ.आर-II]

हरीश कुमार, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 11th July, 2002

S. O. 2353.— Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest, that for the transportation of crude oil from crude oil terminal (COT) at Mundra Port in the State of Gujarat to Bathinda in the State of Punjab through Mundra - Bathinda pipeline, a pipeline should be laid by Guru Gobind Singh Refineries Limited (a subsidiary of Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Limited);

And whereas, it appears to the Central Government that for the purpose of the laying the said pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user (ROU) in the land under which the said pipeline is proposed to be laid, and which is described in the Schedule annexed to this notification;

Now, therefore, in exercise of powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Any person interested in the land described in the said Schedule may, within twenty-one days from the date on which the copies of this notification, as published in the Gazette of India, are made available to the general public, object in writing to the acquisition of the right of user therein or laying of the pipeline under the land to Shri D.K.PAREKH, Competent Authority, Mundra-Bathinda Crude Oil Pipeline, Guru Gobind Singh Refineries Limited (A subsidiary of Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Limited), P.B.No.43, Unit 2, HPCL., At & PO Khari Rohar, Tal. Gandhidham, State Gujarat.

## SCHEDULE

Taluka :- Santalpur

District :- Patan

State :- Gujarat

Name of Village	Survey No	Part if Any	ROU Area		
			Ha.	Ar.	Sq.mt.
1	2	3	4		
(1) SANTALPUR	151	P      Cart Track P	0	29	30
	152		0	40	99
	153		0	07	98
	154		0	18	73
	179		0	40	50
	198		0	01	49
	198		0	24	90
	204		0	15	42
	203		0	01	05
	206		0	30	25
	207		0	08	56
	208		0	28	62
	209		0	13	05
	210		0	27	34
	211		0	21	08
	190		0	56	16
	189		0	09	08
	219		0	30	01
(2) PAR	838		0	25	09
	833/1		0	38	02
	842		0	03	37
	843		0	15	26
	844		0	15	91
	845		0	07	93
	825		0	42	25
	824		0	11	09
	823		0	37	40
	819		0	33	12
	812		0	00	10
	813/1		0	16	41
	815		0	44	81
	816		0	00	34
	814/1		0	36	23
	814/2		0	00	09
	794		0	16	98

Taluka :- Santalpur

District :- Patan

State :- Gujarat

Name of Village	Survey No	Part If Any	ROU Area		
			Ha.	Ar.	Sq.mt.
1	2	3	4		
(2) PAR (Contd.)	793		0	19	36
	792		0	18	47
	791		0	18	57
	645	P	0	75	58
	646		0	16	72
	647		0	76	14
	648	P	0	38	95
	649		0	42	21
	656		0	20	99
	657		0	35	41
	658		0	54	52
	663/1		0	19	11
	663/2		0	21	76
	664		0	03	61
	—	Cart Track	0	09	36
	669		0	48	44
	670		0	24	76
	676		0	24	37
	675		0	17	01
	674		0	19	43
	673		0	04	55
	484		0	21	97
	485		0	14	88
	482		0	09	59
	486		0	12	14
	481		0	08	12
	478		0	00	74
	487		0	22	04
	488		0	14	91
	477/1		0	22	97
	474		0	22	87
	490		0	03	73
	473		0	14	06
	472		0	11	94
	470		0	34	44
	467		0	33	48
	464		0	20	04

Taluka :- Santalpur

District :- Patan

State :- Gujarat

Name of Village	Survey No	Part If Any	ROU Area		
			Ha.	Ar.	Sq.mt.
1	2	3	4		
(2) PAR (Contd.)	465		0	18	98
	463		0	36	16
	459		0	33	97
	435	P	0	32	09
(3) CHHANSARA	48		0	17	76
	47		0	00	10
	49		0	29	21
	50		0	11	78
	51		0	65	03
	53		0	46	29
	---		0	02	98
	61	P	0	44	34
	61	P	0	01	10
	63		0	00	10
	65		0	65	09
	66		0	12	84
	64	P	0	51	43
	74		0	34	82
	81		0	02	98
	82		0	36	15
	85		0	46	75
	84	P	0	18	15
	---		0	02	68
	108		0	21	80
	88		0	11	98
	107		0	32	43
	---		0	02	51
	118		0	16	15
	119		0	40	66
	116		0	09	14
	120		0	20	22
	164		0	28	42
	165		0	11	07
	166		0	28	62
	186		0	20	98
	187		0	11	72

Taluka :- Santalpur

District :- Patan

State :- Gujarat

Name of Village	Survey No	Part if Any	ROU Area		
			Ha.	Ar.	Sq.mt.
1	2	3	4		
(3) CHHANSARA (Contd.)	188	P	0	22	63
	190		0	21	98
	189		0	13	12
	191		0	01	24
	192		0	23	07
	193		0	28	37
	—	Cart Track	0	00	13
	194	P	0	46	86
	194	P Cart Track	0	01	10
	200	P	0	36	10
	200	P Cart Track	0	04	77
	207	P	0	43	50
	207	P Cart Track	0	01	10
	206		0	46	54
	45	P	0	14	05
(4) DAIGAMDA	32	P	0	26	49
	32	P Cart Track	0	01	10
	19	P	0	73	94
	17		0	20	36
	20	P	0	78	61
	13		0	19	92
	12		0	28	96
	11		0	21	74
	28		0	71	45
	29		0	01	62
	36		0	00	48
	34		0	46	65
	—	Cart Track	0	03	38
	82/1		0	36	65
	82/2		0	15	59
	83		0	36	11
	—	Cart Track	0	01	34
	84		0	29	90
	90		0	31	68
	89		0	34	16
	103	P	0	48	83
	103	P Cart Track	0	01	10



Taluka :- Santalpur

District :- Patan

State :- Gujarat

Name of Village	Survey No	Part if Any	ROU Area		
			Ha.	Ar.	Sq.mt.
1	2	3	4		
(4) DAIGAMDA (Contd.)	103	P Cart Track	0	01	10
	103	P Cart Track	0	01	10
	104	P	0	49	08
	126	P	0	38	51
	—	Cart Track	0	05	81
	127		0	06	26
	125		0	14	97
	—	Cart Track	0	02	79
	124		0	34	22
	119		0	16	54
	123		0	10	47
	120		0	50	61
	121		0	07	44
(5) BAMROLI	196		0	02	53
	182		0	46	40
	180	P	0	17	12
	174		0	27	86
	175		0	34	05
	172	P	0	36	64
	171/1		0	05	04
	148		0	17	62
	150		0	18	74
	152		0	49	09
	153		0	41	79
	154		0	19	53
	—	Cart Track	0	05	63
	128		0	33	83
	127		0	10	21
	126		0	24	46
	125		0	29	53
	518	P	1	20	66
	30	P	0	29	80
	30	P Cart Track	0	01	10
	29/1		0	10	07
	29/2		0	14	52
	28		0	18	77

Taluka :- Santalpur

District :- Patan

State :- Gujarat

Name of Village	Survey No	Part If Any	ROU Area		
			Ha.	Ar.	Sq.mt.
1	2	3	4		
(5) BAMROLI (Contd.)	27		0	27	58
	25		0	12	57
	22		0	11	41
	21		0	14	88
	20		0	36	16
	18		0	30	58
(6) DABHI	44/1		0	25	23
	44/2		0	12	56
(7) UNROT	186		0	38	05
	184		0	27	65
	181		0	02	86
	179		0	28	02
	178		0	41	98
	177		0	12	80
	154		0	28	92
	162		0	32	64
	161	P	0	11	28
	161	P Cart Track	0	01	10
	163		0	22	95
	164		0	39	18
	165		0	38	34
	167		0	17	39
	14	P	1	77	06
	14	P Cart Track	0	01	10
	16/2		0	36	11
	29	P	0	24	70
	29	P Cart Track	0	01	10
	28	P	0	09	73
	28	P Cart Track	0	01	10
	30		0	32	07
	37		0	21	32
	38	P	0	23	99
	38	P Cart Track	0	11	44
	40		0	37	95
	42		0	44	68
	41		0	21	57

Taluka :- Santalpur

District :- Patan

State :- Gujarat

Name of Village	Survey No	Part if Any	ROU Area		
			Ha.	Ar.	Sq.mt.
1	2	3	4		
(8) JARUSA	146		0	48	19
	149	P	0	23	01
	144/2		0	00	36
	150		0	36	49
	143	P	0	01	60
	143	P Cart Track	0	00	55
	142	P Cart Track	0	00	55
	142	P	0	28	38
	151		0	31	05
	53	P	3	93	90
	53	P Cart Track	0	01	10
	53	P Cart Track	0	01	10
	53	P Cart Track	0	01	10
	53	P Cart Track	0	01	10
	304		0	16	47
	53	P Cart Track	0	01	10
	306	P	0	59	02
	303/1		0	22	26
	303/2		0	30	97
	302	P Cart Track	0	01	10
	302	P	0	30	10
	300		0	02	90
	301		0	11	42
	298		0	28	85
	297	P	0	36	54
(9) ZEKADA	581		0	20	99
	582		0	15	33
	583		0	30	62
	585	P	0	29	19
	591		0	24	08
	592		0	26	28
	593		0	17	22
	594		0	03	27
	—	Cart Track	0	02	50
	610		0	26	24
	607	P	0	32	13

Taluka :- Santalpur

District :- Patan

State :- Gujarat

Name of Village	Survey No	Part If Any	ROU Area		
			Ha.	Ar.	Sq.mt.
1	2	3	4		
(9) ZEKADA (Contd.)	627		0	34	08
	628	P	0	41	01
	7		0	12	12
	—	Cart Track	0	02	43
	6		0	31	30
	5		0	13	97
	4		0	09	36
	23		0	01	15
	24	P	0	30	39
	—	Cart Track	0	03	55
	87		0	18	10
	86		0	25	45
	85		0	35	01
	—	Cart Track	0	02	48
	108	P	0	28	48
	—	Cart Track	0	05	72
	107		0	53	13
	100		0	05	40
	106		0	17	68
	105		0	15	37
	101		0	14	27
	102		0	24	30
	—	Cart Track	0	06	97
	270		0	24	61
	268	P	0	35	98
	266		0	22	80
	264		0	18	40
	261		0	29	17
	263		0	00	10
	262	P	0	47	39
	262	P	0	01	10
	254		0	18	05
	255	P	0	02	65
	253	P	0	46	95
	251		0	15	13
	250		0	44	50

Taluka :- Santalpur

District :- Patan

State :- Gujarat

Name of Village ~	Survey No	Part if Any	ROU Area		
			Ha	Ar.	Sq mt.
1	2	3	4		
(9) ZEKADA (Contd.)	249	P	0	00	10
	245		0	29	91
	246		0	26	94
	238		0	48	51
	---	Cart Track	0	00	13

[No R-31015/9/2002-O R-II]  
HARISH KUMAR, Under Secy

नई दिल्ली, 16 जुलाई, 2002

का. आ. 2354.— केन्द्रीय सरकार को लोकहित में यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि गुजरात राज्य में जामनगर से मध्यप्रदेश राज्य में भोपाल तक प्राकृतिक गैस के परिवहन के लिए गैस ट्रांसपोर्टेशन एंड इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर कम्पनी लिमिटेड द्वारा पाइपलाइन बिछाई जानी चाहिए ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार को ऐसी पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि उस भूमि में जिसके भीतर उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाए जाने का प्रस्ताव है और जो इस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित है, उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाए ;

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उसमें उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा करती है ;

कोई व्यक्ति जो उक्त अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में हितबद्ध है, उस तारीख से जिसको भारत के राजपत्र में यथा प्रकाशित इस अधिसूचना की प्रतियां साधारण जनता को उपलब्ध करा दी जाती हैं, इक्कीस दिन के भीतर, भूमि के नीचे पाइपलाइन बिछाई जाने के लिए उपयोग के अधिकार के अर्जन के संबंध में श्री एन. एस. कनेश, सक्षम प्राधिकारी, जी.टी. आई. सी. एल, पाइपलाइन परियोजना, भूमि तल, 24 अ, चन्द्रनगर, ए0 बी0 रोड, इन्दौर-452008 को लिखित रूप में आक्षेप भेज सकेगा।

### अनुसूची

तहसील : सरदारपुर

जिला : धार

राज्य : मध्यप्रदेश

गांव का नाम		सर्वे नंबर	क्षेत्रफल		
			हेक्टेयर	आरे	सेन्टीयर
1		2	3	4	5
1.टिमायची		301	0	25	55
		307	0	13	95
		319	0	6	30
		355	0	2	95
		1199	0	0	5
2.मानगढ़		32/1	0	0	10
		873/2	0	42	45
		140	0	2	35
		294	0	11	80

उपरोक्त सर्वे नंबर पूर्व में का.आ. 210 दिनांक 22.01.2002 में सम्मिलित नहीं है ।

[फा. सं. प्ल. 14014/34/2001-जी.पी.]

स्वामी मित्र, निदेशक

New Delhi, the 16th July, 2002

S. O. 2354.— Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transportation of natural gas from Jamnagar in the State of Gujarat to Bhopal in the State of Madhya Pradesh a pipeline should be laid by Gas Transportation and Infrastructure Company Limited.;

And, whereas, it appears to the Central Government that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in land under which the said pipeline, is proposed to be laid and which is described in the Schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Any person interested in the land described in the said Schedule may, within twenty-one days from the date on which the copies of this notification, as published in the Gazette of India, are made available to the general public, object in writing to the acquisition of the right of user therein for laying of the pipeline under the land to Shri N.S.Kanesh, Competent Authority, GTICL Pipeline Project, Ground floor, 24-A Chandra Nagar, A.B.Road, Indore-452008.

**SCHEDULE****Tehsil : Sardarpur****District : Dhar****State : Madhya Pradesh**

Name of the Village	Survey No.	AREA		
		Hectare	Are	C-Are
1	2	3	4	5
<b>1 TIMAYICHI</b>	301	0	25	55
	307	0	13	95
	319	0	6	30
	355	0	2	95
	1199	0	0	5
<b>2 BHANGAD</b>	32/1	0	0	10
	873/2	0	42	45
	140	0	2	35
	294	0	11	80

The above Survey numbers have not appeared earlier wide S.O.210 dated 22.01.2002

[No L. 14014/34/2001-G P]  
SWAMI SINGH, Director

नई दिल्ली, 16 जुलाई, 2002

का. आ. 2355.— केन्द्रीय सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, भारत के राजपत्र, भाग 2, खंड 3, उपखंड (ii) तारीख 26 जनवरी, 2002 में पृष्ठ 718 से पृष्ठ 729 पर प्रकाशित भारत सरकार के पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना सं. का. आ. 210, तारीख 22 जनवरी, 2002 में निम्नलिखित सशोधन करती है, अर्थात् :-

उक्त अधिसूचना की अनुसूची में -

पृष्ठ 718, स्तंभ 1 में ग्राम "टिमायची" के सामने,

- (क) स्तंभ 2 के सर्वेक्षण सं. "329" में स्तंभ 3,4 और 5 में क्षेत्र "00-11-80" के स्थान पर क्षेत्र "00-18-45" रखा जायेगा ;
- (ख) स्तंभ 2 के सर्वेक्षण सं. "328" में स्तंभ 3,4 और 5 में क्षेत्र "00-59-40" के स्थान पर क्षेत्र "01-11-25" रखा जायेगा ;

[ फा. सं. एल. 14014/34/2001 जी.पी. ]  
स्वामी सिंह, निदेशक

New Delhi, the 16th July, 2002

S. O. 2355.— In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby makes the following amendments in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum and Natural Gas, number S.O. 210, dated the 22nd January, 2002, published at pages 727 to 729 in Part II, section 3, sub-section (ii) of the Gazette of India, dated the 26th January, 2002, namely:-

In the Schedule to the said notification:-

at page 727, against village "TIMAYICHI" in column 1,

- a) in survey No. "329" in column 2, for the area "00-11-90" in columns 3,4 and 5, the area "00-18-45" shall be substituted;
- b) in survey No. "328" in column 2, for the area "00-59-40" in columns 3,4 and 5, the area "01-11-25" shall be substituted.

[No. I., 14014/34/2001-G.P.]

SWAMI SINGH, Director

नई दिल्ली, 17 जुलाई, 2002

का. आ. 2356.— केन्द्रीय सरकार को लोकहित में यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि गुजरात राज्य में मुन्द्रा पत्तनस्थित अपरिष्कृत तेल संस्थापन (सी.ओ.टी.) से पंजाब राज्य में भटिंडा तक मुन्द्रा-भटिंडा पाइपलाइन के माध्यम से अपरिष्कृत तेल के परिवहन के लिए एक पाइपलाइन गुरु गोबिन्द सिंह रिफाइनरीज लिमिटेड (हिन्दुस्तान पेट्रोलियम कॉर्पोरेशन की समनुषंगी) द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए उस भूमि में जिसके भीतर उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाए जाने का प्रस्ताव है और जो इस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित है, उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाए ;

अतः अब केन्द्रीय सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उसमें उपयोग के अधिकार को अर्जित करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा करती है ;

कोई व्यक्ति, जो उक्त अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में हितबद्ध है, उस तारीख से, जिसको उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन भारत के राजपत्र में यथाप्रकाशित इस अधिसूचना की प्रतियां साधारण जनता को उपलब्ध करा दी जाती है, इक्कीस दिन के भीतर, उसके उपयोग के या भूमि के भीतर पाइपलाइन बिछाने के अधिकार के अर्जन के संबंध में श्री डी. के. पारेख, सक्षम प्राधिकारी, मुन्द्रा-भटिंडा अपरिष्कृत तेल पाइपलाइन, गुरु गोबिन्द सिंह रिफाइनरीज लिमिटेड (हिन्दुस्तान पेट्रोलियम कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड की समनुषंगी), डा. घ. सं.-43, यूनिट-2, एच. पी. सी. एल., मु. पो. खारी रोहर, तालुका गांधीधाम, गुजरात को लिखित रूप में आक्षेप भेज सकेगा ।



## अनुसूची

तहसील :- रापर

जिला :- कच्छ

राज्य :- गुजरात

गाँव का नाम	सर्वे संख्या	भाग यदि है तो	क्षेत्रफल		
			हेक्टर	आर	सेन्टी आर
1	2	3	4		
(1). गोविन्दपर	ट्रार्वस 98	पेकी	0	20	10
	-	नाला	0	00	34
	ट्रार्वस 98	पेकी	0	50	15
	72/1	पेकी	0	07	55
	-	नाला	0	00	23
	74		0	20	80
	76/1		0	06	37
	75		0	21	02
	ट्रार्वस 98	पेकी	0	05	37
	-	कार्ट ट्रैक	0	00	64
	ट्रार्वस 98	पेकी	0	17	59
	79		0	47	82
	78	पेकी	0	01	97
	ट्रार्वस 98	पेकी	0	17	40
	-	कार्ट ट्रैक	0	00	89
	ट्रार्वस 98	पेकी	0	55	56
	82		0	00	01
	81/2		0	34	43
	ट्रार्वस 98	पेकी	0	22	32
	83		0	14	07
	-	नाला	0	00	44
	ट्रार्वस 98	पेकी	0	05	96
	-	नाला	0	03	79
	ट्रार्वस 98	पेकी	0	62	23
	66/1		0	07	09
	ट्रार्वस 98	पेकी	0	16	50
	-	नाला	0	01	74

तहसील :- रापर

जिला :- कच्छ

राज्य :- गुजरात

गाँव का नाम	सर्वे सँख्या	भाग यदि है तो	क्षेत्रफल		
			हेक्टर	आर	सेन्टी आर
1	2	3	4		
(1). गोविन्दपर (जारी...)	ट्रार्वस 98	पैकी	0	14	96
	-	नाला	0	06	59
	ट्रार्वस 98	पैकी	0	44	73
	85		0	27	70
	ट्रार्वस 98	पैकी	0	59	50
	-	नाला	0	05	37
	ट्रार्वस 98	पैकी	0	46	48
	93		0	00	83
	91		0	56	28
	97/1		0	03	29
	ट्रार्वस 98	पैकी	0	65	86
	-	कार्ट ट्रैक	0	00	88
	5/1	पैकी	0	56	30
	ट्रार्वस 98	पैकी	0	02	99
	13/2		0	03	78
	14/1		0	05	90
	14/2		0	26	10
	12		0	44	37
	-	नाला	0	09	67
(2). देदरवा	ट्रार्वस 221	पैकी	0	07	95
	-	नदी	0	04	84
	ट्रार्वस 221	पैकी	0	19	17
	137		0	34	72
	-	नाला	0	06	29
	138		0	13	12
	136/2		0	01	15
	139		0	51	06
	142/1		0	14	71
	142/2		0	29	84

तहसील :- रापर

जिला :- कच्छ

राज्य :- गुजरात

गाँव का नाम	सर्वे सँख्या	भाग यदि है तो	क्षेत्रफल		
			हेक्टर	आर	सेन्टी आर
1	2	3	4		
(2). देदरवा	ट्रार्वस 221	पैकी	0	09	14
(जारी...)	123		0	07	15
	124/3		0	12	71
	124/2		0	21	01
	124/1		0	13	70
	ट्रार्वस 221	पैकी	0	19	89
	125		0	39	96
	ट्रार्वस 221	पैकी	0	20	71
	116		0	00	58
	117		0	60	01
	118		0	13	63
	ट्रार्वस 221	पैकी	0	62	67
	106/2		0	13	64
	106/3		0	05	43
	105/2		0	23	73
	ट्रार्वस 221	पैकी	0	00	21
	104		0	34	38
	103/2		0	12	08
	-	कार्ट ट्रैक	0	02	65
	ट्रार्वस 221	पैकी	0	06	22
	102		0	85	18
	100/2	पैकी	0	21	16
	ट्रार्वस 221	पैकी	0	10	37
	98		0	53	69
	ट्रार्वस 221	पैकी	0	70	29
	97		0	08	47
	84		0	05	09
	83/1		0	31	72
	83/2		0	15	54
	85/1		0	00	94
	ट्रार्वस 221	पैकी	0	73	38
	80	पैकी	0	53	34

हल सील :- रापर

जिला :- कच्छ

राज्य :- गुजरात

गाँव का नाम	सर्वे सँख्या	भाग यदी है तो	क्षेत्रफल		
			हेक्टर	आर	सेन्टी आर
1	2	3	4		
(2). देदरावा (जारी...)	76		0	29	99
	75		0	25	20
	74/1		0	35	73
	74/2		0	04	77
	74/3		0	36	25
	74/4		0	06	12
(3). सई	द्वारस 892	पेकी	0	08	17
	443/1		0	15	77
	443/2		0	25	91
	द्वारस 892	पेकी	0	13	45
	437		0	36	22
	438		0	44	44
	435		0	12	71
	439		0	24	87
	440		0	02	89
	432		0	31	16
	431/1		0	24	37
	-	नाला	0	15	39
	466		0	24	90
	-	कार्ट ट्रैक	0	05	77
	353	पेकी	0	34	35
	355	पेकी	0	21	16
	357/2		0	23	62
	356/1		0	15	85
	356/2		0	29	91
	362/1		0	03	85
	-	कार्ट ट्रैक	0	04	68

महसील :- रापर

जिला :- कच्छ

राज्य :- गुजरात

गाँव का नाम	सर्वे सँख्या	भाग यदि है तो	क्षेत्रफल		
			हेक्टर	आर	सेन्टी आर
1	2	3	4		
(3). सई (जारी...)	ट्रार्वस 892	पैकी	0	20	43
	328		0	15	89
	329		0	22	84
	330	पैकी	0	31	61
	338	पैकी	0	33	78
	337		0	39	09
	187	पैकी	0	22	81
	186	पैकी	0	17	47
	182/1		0	35	18
	181		0	25	54
	179	पैकी	0	53	65
	195/1	पैकी	0	01	63
	177/1		0	14	53
	177/2		0	18	56
	176		0	31	43
	165	पैकी	0	60	17
	124		0	43	92
	123		0	12	73
	121	पैकी	0	28	37
	119/1		0	38	43
	120		0	00	07
	112	पैकी	0	73	06
	111	पैकी	0	02	68
	115/1		0	07	83
	113		0	11	06
	ट्रार्वस 892	पैकी	0	09	34
(4). किडीयानगर	571		0	30	18
	569/1	पैकी	0	37	87
	ट्रार्वस 1318	पैकी	0	20	52

ग्रहण :- रापर

जिला :- कच्छ

राज्य :- गुजरात

गाँव का नाम	सर्वे सँख्या	भाग यदि है तो	क्षेत्रफल		
			हेक्टर	आर	सेन्टी आर
1	2	3	4		
(4). किडीयानगर (जारी...)	591/1	पेकी	0	25	10
	ट्रार्क्स 1318	पेकी	0	06	13
	591/6		0	27	08
	-	पेकी कार्ट ट्रैक	0	03	15
	590/3		0	20	60
	590/2		0	12	94
	589/2		0	13	17
	589/1		0	18	57
	585		0	44	48
	586	पेकी	0	25	69
	583/1		0	21	87
	583/2		0	19	50
	ट्रार्क्स 1318	पेकी	0	01	35
	-	नाला	0	04	04
	ट्रार्क्स 1318	पेकी	0	10	32
	-	कार्ट ट्रैक	0	01	04
	ट्रार्क्स 1318	पेकी	0	14	77
	701/1		0	28	00
	701/2		0	16	69
	685		0	35	76
	696/2		0	14	63
	695/1		0	24	64
	694/1		0	18	39
	693/1		0	18	78
	693/2		0	11	19
	691/1		0	18	73
	691/2		0	22	37

तहसील :- रापर

जिला :- कच्छ

राज्य :- गुजरात

गाँव का नाम	सर्वे सँख्या	भाग यदि है तो	क्षेत्रफल		
			हेक्टर	आर	सेन्टी आर
1	2	3	4		
(4). किडीयानगर (जारी...)	691/4		0	07	24
	द्वारस 1318	पैकी	0	07	18
	-	नाला	0	03	76
	द्वारस 1318	पैकी	0	46	69
	743	पैकी	0	39	37
	-	नाला	0	03	49
	द्वारस 1318	पैकी	0	59	01
	811/1		0	01	04
	-	नाला	0	00	62
	द्वारस 1318	पैकी	0	13	59
	812/1	पैकी	0	21	94
	-	कार्ट ट्रैक	0	01	13
	द्वारस 1318	पैकी	0	07	77
	-	नाला	0	03	74
	द्वारस 1318	पैकी	0	06	99
	-	नाला	0	01	70
	द्वारस 1318	पैकी	0	28	86
	-	कार्ट ट्रैक	0	10	04
	द्वारस 1318	पैकी	0	31	21
	-	नाला	0	00	48
	द्वारस 1318	पैकी	0	28	49
	945	पैकी	0	46	05
	948	पैकी	0	36	89
	-	नाला	0	06	05
	949		0	27	29
	द्वारस 1318	पैकी	0	21	36
	-	नाला	0	00	64

तालिका :- रापर

जिला :- कच्छ

राज्य :- गुजरात

गाँव का नाम	सर्वे सँख्या	भाग यदि है तो	क्षेत्रफल		
			हेक्टर	आर	मेन्टी आर
1	2	3	4		
(4). किडीयानगर (जारी...)	970	पैकी	0	14	36
	969		0	40	71
	967	पैकी	0	65	76
	द्रावस 1318	पैकी	0	00	50
	966		0	42	85
	द्रावस 1318	पैकी	0	35	64
	994		0	29	81
	द्रावस 1318	पैकी	0	07	46
	-	नाला	0	11	91
	1215		0	29	08
	1216		0	07	26
	1217		0	23	21
	1219/4		0	03	70
	1220/1		0	00	89
	द्रावस 1318	पैकी	0	00	51
	-	कार्ट ट्रैक	0	00	81
	द्रावस 1318	पैकी	0	04	74
	-	नाला	0	29	19
	द्रावस 1318	पैकी	0	19	36
	1189/1		0	26	87
	-	कार्ट ट्रैक	0	03	80
	1188/1	पैकी	0	66	22
	द्रावस 1318	पैकी	0	30	55
	1187/1	पैकी	0	13	54
	द्रावस 1318	पैकी	0	00	94
	-	नाला	0	01	18
	द्रावस 1318	पैकी	0	06	77
	-	नाला	0	01	69



तहसील :- रापर

जिला :- कच्छ

राज्य :- गुजरात

गाँव का नाम	सर्वे सँख्या	भाग यदि है तो	क्षेत्रफल		
			हेक्टर	आर	सेन्टी आर
1	2	3	4		
(4). किडीयानगर (जारी...)	ट्रार्वस 1318	पैकी	0	13	50
	1182		0	29	02
	ट्रार्वस 1318	पैकी	0	13	33
	1183		0	01	49
	1186	पैकी	0	47	91
	1184		0	02	08
	1185		0	08	13
	-	नाला	0	04	96
	ट्रार्वस 1318	पैकी	0	05	03
(5). बादलपर	29		0	23	20
	26	पैकी	0	25	44
	21/2		0	00	37
	21/1		0	08	34
(6). छोटपर	92/4		0	25	43
	91/3		0	11	29
	91/2		0	21	04
	90		0	03	37
(7). वेकरा	71	पैकी	0	37	53
	ट्रार्वस 129	पैकी	0	31	49
	-	कार्ट ट्रैक	0	00	74
	ट्रार्वस 129	पैकी	0	30	96
	-	कार्ट ट्रैक	0	01	73
	73	पैकी	0	35	54
	74		0	00	86
	ट्रार्वस 129	पैकी	0	03	35
	-	कार्ट ट्रैक	0	01	22
	ट्रार्वस 129	पैकी	0	76	52
	-	कार्ट ट्रैक	0	02	77
	ट्रार्वस 129	पैकी	0	01	77
	78/2		0	19	73

तकसील :- रापर

जिला :- कच्छ

राज्य :- गुजरात

गाँव का नाम	सर्वे सँख्या	भाग यदी है तो	क्षेत्रफल		
			हेक्टर	आर	सेन्टी आर
1	2	3	4		
(7). वेकरा	ट्रावर्स 129	पैकी	0	24	28
(जारी...)	81		0	60	90
	82		0	70	40

[फा. सं. आर-31015/10/2002-ओ.आर-II]

हरीश कुमार, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 17th July, 2002

S. O. 2356.— Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transportation of crude oil from crude oil terminal (COT) at Mundra Port in the State of Gujarat to Bathinda in the State of Punjab through Mundra - Bathinda pipeline, a pipeline should be laid by Guru Gobind Singh Refineries Limited (a subsidiary of Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Limited);

And whereas, it appears to the Central Government that for the purpose of the laying the said pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user (ROU) in the land under which the said pipeline is proposed to be laid, and which is described in the Schedule annexed to this notification;

Now, therefore, in exercise of powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Any person interested in the land described in the said Schedule may, within twenty one days from the date on which the copies of the notification issued under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the said Act, as published in the Gazette of India, are made available to the general public, object in writing to the acquisition of the right of user therein or laying of the pipeline under the land to Shri D.K.PAREKH, Competent Authority, Mundra-Bathinda Crude Oil Pipeline, Guru Gobind Singh Refineries Limited (A subsidiary of Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Limited), P.B.No.43, Unit 2, HPCL., At & PO Khari Rohar, Tal. Gandhidham, Gujarat, ~~State~~.

## SCHEDULE

Taluka :- Rapar

District :- Kutch

State :- Gujarat

Name of Village	Survey No	Part if Any	ROU Area		
			Ha.	Ar.	Sq.mt.
1	2	3	4		
(1). Govindpar	Trowers 98	P	0	20	10
	-	Nala	0	00	34
	Trowers 98	P	0	50	15
	72/1	P	0	07	55
	-	Nala	0	00	23
	74		0	20	80
	76/1		0	06	37
	75		0	21	02
	Trowers 98	P	0	05	37
	-	Cart Track	0	00	64
	Trowers 98	P	0	17	59
	79		0	47	82
	78	P	0	01	97
	Trowers 98	P	0	17	40
	-	Cart Track	0	00	89
	Trowers 98	P	0	55	56
	82		0	00	01
	81/2		0	34	43
	Trowers 98	P	0	22	32
	83		0	14	07
	-	Nala	0	00	44
	Trowers 98	P	0	05	96
	-	Nala	0	03	79
	Trowers 98	P	0	62	23
	66/1		0	07	09
	Trowers 98	P	0	16	50
	-	Nala	0	01	74

Taluka :- Rapar

District :- Kutch

State :- Gujarat

Name of Village	Survey No	Part if Any	ROU Area		
			Ha.	Ar.	Sq.mt.
1	2	3	4		
(1). Govindpar (Contd.)	Trowers 98	P	0	14	96
	-	Nala	0	06	59
	Trowers 98	P	0	44	73
	85		0	27	10
	Trowers 98	P	0	59	50
	-	Nala	0	05	37
	Trowers 98	P	0	46	48
	93		0	00	83
	91		0	56	28
	97/1		0	03	29
	Trowers 98	P	0	65	86
	-	Cart Track	0	00	88
	5/1	P	0	56	30
	Trowers 98	P	0	02	99
	13/2		0	03	78
	14/1		0	05	90
	14/2		0	26	10
	12		0	44	37
	-	Nala	0	09	67
(2). Dedarava	Trowers 221	P	0	07	95
	-	River	0	04	84
	Trowers 221	P	0	19	17
	137		0	34	72
	-	Nala	0	06	29
	138		0	13	12
	136/2		0	01	15
	139		0	51	06
	142/1		0	14	71
	142/2		0	29	84

Taluka :- Rapar

District :- Kutch

State :- Gujarat

Name of Village	Survey No	Part if Any	ROU Area		
			Ha.	Ar.	Sq.mt.
1	2	3	4		
(2). Dedarava (Contd.)	Trowers 221	P	0	09	14
	123		0	07	15
	124/3		0	12	71
	124/2		0	21	01
	124/1		0	13	70
	Trowers 221	P	0	19	89
	125		0	39	96
	Trowers 221	P	0	20	71
	116		0	00	58
	117		0	60	01
	118		0	13	63
	Trowers 221	P	0	62	67
	106/2		0	13	64
	106/3		0	05	43
	105/2		0	23	73
	Trowers 221	P	0	00	21
	104		0	34	38
	103/2		0	12	08
	-	Cart Track	0	02	65
	Trowers 221	P	0	06	22
	102		0	85	18
	100/2	P	0	21	16
	Trowers 221	P	0	10	37
	98		0	53	69
	Trowers 221	P	0	70	29
	97		0	08	47
	84		0	05	09
	83/1		0	31	72
	83/2		0	15	54
	85/1		0	00	94
	Trowers 221	P	0	73	38
	80	P	0	53	34

Taluka :- Rapar

District :- Kutch

State :- Gujarat

Name of Village	Survey No	Part if Any	ROU Area		
			Ha.	Ar.	Sq.mt.
1	2	3	4		
(2). Dedarava (Contd.)	76		0	29	99
	75		0	25	20
	74/1		0	35	73
	74/2		0	04	77
	74/3		0	36	25
	74/4		0	06	12
(3). Sai	Trowers 892	P	0	08	17
	443/1		0	15	77
	443/2		0	25	91
	Trowers 892	P	0	13	45
	437		0	36	22
	438		0	44	44
	435		0	12	71
	439		0	24	87
	440		0	02	89
	432		0	31	16
	431/1		0	24	37
	-	Nala	0	15	39
	466		0	24	90
	-	Cart Track	0	05	77
	353	P	0	34	35
	355	P	0	21	16
	357/2		0	23	62
	356/1		0	15	85
	356/2		0	29	91
	362/1		0	03	85
	-	Cart Track	0	04	68

Taluka :- Rapar

District :- Kutch

State :- Gujarat

Name of Village	Survey No	Part if Any	ROU Area		
			Ha.	Ar.	Sq.mt.
1	2	3	4		
(3). Sai (Contd.)	Towers 892	P	0	20	43
	328		0	15	89
	329		0	22	84
	330	P	0	31	61
	338	P	0	33	78
	337		0	39	09
	187	P	0	22	81
	186	P	0	17	47
	182/1		0	35	18
	181		0	25	54
	179	P	0	53	65
	195/1	P	0	01	63
	177/1		0	14	53
	177/2		0	18	56
	176		0	31	43
	165	P	0	60	17
	124		0	43	92
	123		0	12	73
	121	P	0	28	37
	119/1		0	38	43
	120		0	00	07
	112	P	0	73	06
	111	P	0	02	68
	115/1		0	07	83
	113		0	11	06
	Towers 892	P	0	09	34
(4). Kidiyanagar	571		0	30	18
	569/1	P	0	37	87
	Towers 1318	P	0	20	52

Taluka :- Rapar

District :- Kutch

State :- Gujarat

Name of Village	Survey No	Part if Any	ROU Area		
			Ha.	Ar.	Sq.mt.
1	2	3	4		
(4). Kidiyanagar (Contd.)	591/1	P	0	25	10
	Trowers 1318	P	0	06	13
	591/6		0	27	08
	-	P Cart Track	0	03	15
	590/3		0	20	60
	590/2		0	12	94
	589/2		0	13	17
	589/1		0	18	57
	585		0	44	48
	586	P	0	25	69
	583/1		0	21	87
	583/2		0	19	50
	Trowers 1318	P	0	01	35
	-	Nala	0	04	04
	Trowers 1318	P	0	10	32
	-	Cart Track	0	01	04
	Trowers 1318	P	0	14	77
	701/1		0	28	00
	701/2		0	16	69
	685		0	35	76
	696/2		0	14	63
	695/1		0	24	64
	694/1		0	18	39
	693/1		0	18	78
	693/2		0	11	19
	691/1		0	18	73
	691/2		0	22	37



Taluka :- Rapar

District :- Kutch

State :- Gujarat

Name of Village	Survey No	Part if Any	ROU Area		
			Ha.	Ar.	Sq.mt.
1	2	3	4		
(4). Kidiyanagar (Contd.)	691/4		0	07	24
	Trowers 1318	P	0	07	18
	-	Nala	0	03	76
	Trowers 1318	P	0	46	69
	743	P	0	39	37
	-	Nala	0	03	49
	Trowers 1318	P	0	59	01
	811/1		0	01	04
	-	Nala	0	00	62
	Trowers 1318	P	0	13	59
	812/1	P	0	21	94
	-	Cart Track	0	01	13
	Trowers 1318	P	0	07	77
	-	Nala	0	03	74
	Trowers 1318	P	0	06	99
	-	Nala	0	01	70
	Trowers 1318	P	0	28	86
	-	Cart Track	0	10	04
	Trowers 1318	P	0	31	21
	-	Nala	0	00	48
	Trowers 1318	P	0	28	49
	945	P	0	46	05
	948	P	0	36	89
	-	Nala	0	06	05
	949		0	27	29
	Trowers 1318	P	0	21	36
	-	Nala	0	00	64

Taluka :- Rapar

District :- Kutch

State :- Gujarat

Name of Village	Survey No	Part if Any	ROU Area		
			Ha.	Ar.	Sq.mt.
1	2	3	4		
(4). Kidiyanagar (Contd.)	970	P	0	14	36
	969		0	40	71
	967	P	0	65	76
	Trowers 1318	P	0	00	50
	966		0	42	85
	Trowers 1318	P	0	35	64
	994		0	29	81
	Trowers 1318	P	0	07	46
	-	Nala	0	11	91
	1215		0	29	08
	1216		0	07	26
	1217		0	23	21
	1219/4		0	03	70
	1220/1		0	00	89
	Trowers 1318	P	0	00	51
	-	Cart Track	0	00	81
	Trowers 1318	P	0	04	74
	-	Nala	0	29	19
	Trowers 1318	P	0	19	36
	1189/1		0	26	87
	-	Cart Track	0	03	80
	1188/1	P	0	66	22
	Trowers 1318	P	0	30	55
	1187/1	P	0	13	54
	Trowers 1318	P	0	00	94
	-	Nala	0	01	18
	Trowers 1318	P	0	06	77
	-	Nala	0	01	69

Taluka :- Rapar

District :- Kutch

State :- Gujarat

Name of Village	Survey No	Part if Any	ROU Area		
			Ha.	Ar.	Sq.mt.
1	2	3	4		
(4). Kidiyanagar (Contd.)	Trowers 1318	P	0	13	50
	1182		0	29	02
	Trowers 1318	P	0	13	33
	1183		0	01	49
	1186	P	0	47	91
	1184		0	02	08
	1185		0	08	13
	-	Nala	0	04	96
	Trowers 1318	P	0	05	03
(5). Badalpar	29		0	23	20
	26	P	0	25	44
	21/2		0	00	37
	21/1		0	08	34
(6). Chhotapar	92/4		0	25	43
	91/3		0	11	29
	91/2		0	21	04
	90		0	03	37
(7). Vekara	71	P	0	37	53
	Trowers 129	P	0	31	49
	-	Cart Track	0	00	74
	Trowers 129	P	0	30	96
	-	Cart Track	0	01	73
	73	P	0	35	54
	74		0	00	86
	Trowers 129	P	0	03	35
	-	Cart Track	0	01	22
	Trowers 129	P	0	76	52
	-	Cart Track	0	02	77
	Trowers 129	P	0	01	77
	78/2		0	19	73

Taluka :- Rapar

District :- Kutch

State :- Gujarat

Name of Village	Survey No	Part if Any	ROU Area		
			Ha.	Ar.	Sq.mt.
1	2	3	4		
(7). Vekara (Contd.)	Trowers 129	P	0	24	28
	81		0	60	90
	82		0	70	40

[No R-31015/10/2002-O R-II]  
HARISH KUMAR, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 17 जुलाई, 2002

का. आ. 2357.— केन्द्रीय सरकार को लोकहित में यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि गुजरात राज्य में मुन्द्रा पत्तन स्थित अपरिष्कृत तेल संस्थापन (सी.ओ.टी.) से पंजाब राज्य में भटिंडा तक मुन्द्रा-भटिंडा पाइपलाइन के माध्यम से अपरिष्कृत तेल के परिवहन के लिए एक पाइपलाइन गुरु गोबिन्द सिंह रिफाइनरीज लिमिटेड (हिन्दुस्तान पेट्रोलियम कॉर्पोरेशन की समनुषंगी) द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार को उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए यह आवश्यक प्रतीत होता है कि उस भूमि में जिसके भीतर उक्त पाइपलाइन बिछाए जाने का प्रस्ताव है और जो इस अधिसूचना से उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित है, उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन किया जाए ;

अतः अब केन्द्रीय सरकार, पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उसमें उपयोग के अधिकार को अर्जित करने के अपने आशय की घोषणा करती है ;

कोई व्यक्ति, जो उक्त अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में हितबद्ध है, उस तारीख से, जिसको उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन भारत के राजपत्र में यथाप्रकाशित इस अधिसूचना की प्रतियां साधारण जनता को उपलब्ध करा दी जाती हैं, इक्कीस दिन के भीतर, उसके उपयोग के या भूमि के भीतर पाइपलाइन बिछाने के अधिकार के अर्जन के संबंध में श्री डी. के. पारेख, सक्षम प्राधिकारी, मुन्द्रा-भटिंडा अपरिष्कृत तेल पाइपलाइन, गुरु गोबिन्द सिंह रिफाइनरीज लिमिटेड (हिन्दुस्तान पेट्रोलियम कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड की समनुषंगी), डा. घ. सं-43, यूनिट-2, हिन्दुस्तान पेट्रोलियम कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड, मु. पो. खारी रोहर, तालुका गांधीधाम, गुजरात को लिखित रूप में आक्षेप भेज सकेगा ।

## अनुसूची

तहसील :- रापर

जिला :- कच्छ

राज्य :- गुजरात

गौव का नाम	सर्वे सँख्या	भाग यदी है तो	क्षेत्रफल		
			हेक्टर	आर	सेन्टी आर
1	2	3	4	5	6
1. भीमासर	944/1		00	08	50
	944/2		00	09	88
	945/1		00	02	72
	943/1		00	12	53
	943/2		00	11	62
	946	पैकी	00	29	83
	947	पैकी	00	29	76
	951/3	पैकी	00	13	40
	938/1		00	26	43
	938/2		00	22	77
	938/3		00	09	25
	937		00	34	35
	921		00	62	92
	913/1		00	15	77
	913/2		00	05	41
	912/2		00	17	00
	912/3		00	22	03
	909/1		00	12	96
	909/2		00	33	62
	910		00	08	88
	908/2		00	18	63
	908/3		00	14	73
	907		00	14	91
	906		00	15	36
	ट्रार्क्स 2220/1	पैकी	00	04	05
	-	नाला	00	06	50
	ट्रार्क्स 2220/1	पैकी	00	00	69
	-	कार्ट ट्रैक	00	00	57
	ट्रार्क्स 2220/1	पैकी	00	19	47
	718	पैकी	00	03	21

तहसील :- रापर		जिला :- कच्छ		राज्य :- गुजरात		
गँव का नाम	सर्वे सँख्या	भाग यही है तो	क्षेत्रफल			
			हेक्टर	आर	सेन्टी आर	
1	2	3	4	5	6	
1. भीमासर (जारी...)	719		00	16	69	
	द्वारस 2220/1	पैकी	00	06	40	
	-	नाला	00	08	09	
	द्वारस 2220/1	पैकी	00	02	65	
	द्वारस 2220/1	पैकी	00	01	88	
	720		00	25	36	
	721		00	36	19	
	722		00	29	17	
	-	कार्ट ट्रैक	00	01	71	
	795/2		00	03	75	
	793		00	01	01	
	द्वारस 2220/1	पैकी	00	29	40	
	728/1	पैकी	00	24	11	
	728/2		00	30	78	
	द्वारस 2220/1	पैकी	00	01	80	
	-	कार्ट ट्रैक	00	03	18	
	द्वारस 2220/1	पैकी	00	02	49	
	729	पैकी	00	20	00	
	729	पैकी	कार्ट ट्रैक	00	00	78
	द्वारस 2220/1	पैकी		00	00	32
	-	कार्ट ट्रैक		00	00	09
	द्वारस 2220/1	पैकी		00	05	51
	735/4			00	14	63
	द्वारस 2220/1	पैकी		00	58	94
	-	कार्ट ट्रैक		00	00	77
	द्वारस 2220/1	पैकी		00	08	80
	-	कार्ट ट्रैक		00	00	81
	द्वारस 2220/1	पैकी		00	09	45
	-	कार्ट ट्रैक		00	00	87
	द्वारस 2220/1	पैकी		00	11	04
	790/1			00	39	14
	-	कार्ट ट्रैक		00	00	86

तहसील :- रापर

जिला :- कच्छ

राज्य :- गुजरात

गाँव का नाम	सर्वे सँख्या	भाग यदि है तो	क्षेत्रफल		
			हेक्टर	आर	सेन्टी आर
1	2	3	4	5	6
1. भीमासर (जारी...)	ट्रार्क्स 2220/1	पैकी	00	31	67
	781/1		00	09	05
	781/2		00	04	07
	782	पैकी	00	22	87
	ट्रार्क्स 2220/1	पैकी	00	43	30
	780	पैकी	00	37	88
	779/1		00	07	16
	ट्रार्क्स 2220/1	पैकी	00	31	62
	809/1		00	09	15
	809/2		00	09	35
	810/1		00	21	13
	810/2		00	14	31
	810/3		00	15	99
	810/4		00	08	98
	ट्रार्क्स 2220/1	पैकी	00	12	64
	-	कार्ट ट्रैक	00	00	79
	ट्रार्क्स 2220/1	पैकी	00	03	43
	812/1	पैकी	00	16	71
	814/1	पैकी	00	18	31
	814/2		00	25	54
	814/3		00	21	08
	815/2		00	01	55
	819		00	33	01
	821	पैकी	00	14	35
	820	पैकी	00	12	05
	825		00	16	00
	822/1		00	04	33
	822/2		00	17	63
	826		00	47	17
	823		00	17	70
	824/1		00	07	19
	824/2		00	06	95
	824/3		00	08	37
	827/1		00	21	07

तहसील :- रापर

जिला :- कच्छ

राज्य :- गुजरात

गौव का नाम	सर्वे सँख्या	भाग यदि है तो	क्षेत्रफल		
			हेक्टर	आर	सेन्टी आर
1	2	3	4	5	6
1. भीमासर (जारी...)	827/2	पेकी	00	17	55
	827/3		00	15	23
	828/1	पेकी	00	23	54
	828/2		00	13	94
	836/1	पेकी	00	13	94
	836/3		00	12	42
	836/4		00	12	93
	829	पेकी	00	17	46
	835/1	पेकी	00	21	05
	835/2		00	03	10
	834/1		00	14	22
	834/3	पेकी	00	07	04
	843/1		00	12	19
	843/2		00	13	63
	844		00	01	41
	845/1		00	01	93
	845/2		00	35	05
	845/3		00	22	26
	850/1		00	00	45
	851	पेकी	00	00	11
	852/3		00	18	43
	852/2		00	01	63
	853/4		00	22	76
	853/3		00	05	30
	853/2		00	06	44
	855/2		00	07	41
	855/1		00	06	30
	856/1		00	16	82
	857/3		00	11	01
	857/2	पेकी	00	22	12
	857/1		00	05	22
	841		00	03	86
	859		00	41	37



तहसील :- रापर

जिला :- कच्छ

राज्य :- गुजरात

गौव का नाम	सर्वे सँख्या	भाग यकी है तो	क्षेत्रफल		
			हेक्टर	आर	सेन्टी आर
1	2	3	4	5	6
1. भीमसर (जारी...)	860/2		00	00	35
	860/1		00	20	17
	861/3		00	06	99
	861/2		00	21	79
	-		00	05	30
	ट्रार्बस 2220/1	पेकी	00	11	09
	-		00	38	00
	ट्रार्बस 2220/1	पेकी	00	25	82
	2191/1		00	07	38
	2191/2		00	24	49
	2190/2		00	04	76
	2190/1		00	25	74
	-		00	12	74
	2185/2	पेकी	00	40	76
	2185/1		00	08	35
	2183/2	पेकी	00	16	64
	2182		00	16	80
	-		00	05	17
	2180/1		00	08	00
	2179/4	पेकी	00	04	23
	2179/3		00	14	01
	2179/2		00	05	26
	2179/1		00	09	81
	2174/3	पेकी	00	00	13
	2178/1	पेकी	00	15	40
	2175/2		00	09	86
	2173/1		00	13	01
	2167		00	13	07
	2169	पेकी	00	25	32
	2161/2		00	01	96
	2161/3		00	07	91
	2161/4		00	08	37
	2162/1		00	06	09
	-		00	03	45
		कार्ट ट्रैक			

तहसील :- रापर		जिला :- कच्छ	राज्य :- गुजरात		
गाँव का नाम	सर्वे सँख्या	भाग यदि है तो	क्षेत्रफल		
			हेक्टर	आर	सेन्टी आर
1	2	3	4	5	6
1. भीमासर (जारी...)	2154/2		00	10	29
	2154/3	पैकी	00	12	07
	2153/2		00	03	71
	2152/1		00	25	19
	2152/2		00	01	36
	2141/2		00	09	13
	2146/1		00	14	97
	2146/2	पैकी	00	14	80
	2143/1		00	12	49
	2143/2		00	12	39
	2144/1		00	13	38
	2144/2		00	12	30
	-	कार्ट ट्रैक	00	03	41
	2129/1		00	08	38
	2129/2		00	14	16
	2130/1	पैकी	00	09	69
	2130/2	पैकी	00	25	26
	-	कार्ट ट्रैक	00	02	64
	-	नाला	00	19	86
	-	कार्ट ट्रैक	00	01	24
	2125/1	पैकी	00	13	70
	2122/2		00	15	80
	2122/3		00	17	90
	2121/2	पैकी	00	14	08
	2121/3		00	15	53
	2123/3		00	05	41
	2119/1		00	09	97
	2119/2		00	00	11
	2117/2		00	13	89
	2116/1		00	32	96
	2116/2		00	04	32
	2115/1		00	24	35
	-	कार्ट ट्रैक	00	07	01
	2104/2		00	08	86

तहसील :- रापर		जिला :- कच्छ	राज्य :- गुजरात		
गौव का नाम	सर्वे सँख्या	भाग यदि है तो	क्षेत्रफल		
			हेक्टर	आर	सेन्टी आर
1	2	3	4	5	6
1. भीमासर (जारी...)	2105/1	पैकी	00	29	58
	2105/2		00	32	79
	2106/1	पैकी	00	33	90
	2106/2		00	17	03
	2106/3		00	02	19
	2106/4		00	09	23
	2107/1		00	23	81
	2107/2	पैकी	00	25	14
	2107/3		00	08	86
	2110/1		00	06	51
	2211		00	13	46
	2210		00	06	16
	2209		00	03	85
	2056/1	पैकी	00	13	15
	2056/2	पैकी	00	14	31
	2055/8		00	17	84
	2055/7		00	04	19
	2055/6		00	08	09
	2055/4		00	06	56
	2058/3		00	01	10
	2058/2		00	19	50
	2058/1	पैकी	00	10	87
	2054/6		00	10	77
	2054/4	पैकी	00	04	85
	2054/5	पैकी	00	21	48
	2054/3	पैकी	00	06	20
	2059/7		00	04	87
	2053/6		00	17	97
	2053/5		00	14	30
	2052/3		00	16	46
	2052/2		00	15	49
	2052/5		00	19	76
	2052/1		00	12	91

तहसील :- रापर		जिला :- कच्छ	राज्य :- गुजरात		
गाँव का नाम	सर्वे सँख्या	भाग यदि है तो	क्षेत्रफल		
			हेक्टर	आर	सेन्टी आर
1	2	3	4	5	6
1. भीमासर (जारी...)	2051/3	पैकी	00	00	96
	2051/2	पैकी	00	14	15
	2050/2		00	15	84
	2050/3		00	16	80
	2049/4		00	21	09
	2049/3		00	06	31
	2049/2		00	31	56
	2049/1		00	05	28
	2048/2		00	00	14
	2048/1		00	25	41
	2046/2		00	22	02
	2045		00	15	40
	2044		00	14	20
	2043/1		00	30	21
	2041/1		00	19	40
	2041/2		00	00	36
	2040/2	पैकी	00	82	42
	2039/1		00	17	14
	2038/5		00	01	83
	2038/4		00	06	45
	2038/3		00	05	27
	2038/2		00	09	91
	2037/4	पैकी	00	19	44
	2037/2		00	00	08
	ट्रावर्स 2220/1	पैकी	00	10	81
2. लखागढ	119		00	36	97
	ट्रावर्स 432	पैकी	00	01	20
	97		00	30	18
	96		00	37	43
	94		00	15	95
	93/1		00	30	05
	93/2		00	19	48

तहसील :- रापर

जिला :- कच्छ

राज्य :- गुजरात

गाँव का नाम	सर्वे सँख्या	भाग यही है तो	क्षेत्रफल		
			हेक्टर	आर	सेन्टी आर
1	2	3	4	5	6
3. मंगेरा - जदुपूर	203		00	33	13
	201/1		00	00	86
	202/1		00	16	07
	202/2		00	11	16
	-	कार्ट ट्रैक	00	04	01
	212		00	22	34
	214/2		00	16	61
	214/1		00	31	53
	213	पैकी	00	02	08
	215/2		00	11	48
	-	नस्ला	00	04	10
	225/2		00	12	85
	225/1		00	33	40
	224/2		00	01	11
	219/2		00	22	81
	218/4		00	24	20
	222/2		00	00	22
	220	पैकी	00	09	09
	-	कार्ट ट्रैक	00	04	09
	183/1		00	09	53
	182		00	09	19
	181	पैकी	00	11	26
	180		00	18	39
	-	नस्ला	00	05	51
	169		00	39	44
	द्वारस 241	पैकी	00	05	45
	170/1	पैकी	00	29	28
	171/1		00	19	16
	171/3		00	25	21
	171/4		00	19	92
	द्वारस 241	पैकी	00	73	04
	142	पैकी	00	44	91

तहसील :- रापर		जिला :- कच्छ		राज्य :- गुजरात		
गाँव का नाम	सर्वे सँख्या	भाग यदि है तो	क्षेत्रफल			
			हेक्टर	आर	सेन्टी आर	
1	2	3	4	5	6	
3. भंगेरा - जदुपूर (जारी...)	143/2	पैकी	00	14	94	
	143/1		00	03	47	
	141		00	28	46	
	140		00	01	87	
	139		00	56	34	
4. आदेसर	664	पैकी	00	43	12	
	663		00	15	28	
	665/1		00	53	91	
	656		00	32	79	
	651/1		00	37	16	
	650		00	31	14	
	649		00	23	36	
	646		00	26	28	
	645/1		00	13	46	
	647		00	18	24	
	645/3		00	32	77	
	द्वार्षस 771		}	00	09	93
	-					
	642		00	37	60	
	643		00	21	42	
	द्वार्षस 771		}	00	11	18
	-					
	640/1		00	25	28	
	द्वार्षस 771		00	15	93	
	641/1		00	60	20	
	641/3		00	13	50	
	-		कार्ट ट्रैक	00	06	95
	634/2		00	12	14	
	634/1		00	26	02	
	632		तलाब	00	89	49
	द्वार्षस 771		}	00	24	86
	-					
	631		00	14	14	

तहसील :- रापर		जिला :- कच्छ	राज्य :- गुजरात		
गाँव का नाम	सर्वे सँख्या	भाग यदि है तो	क्षेत्रफल		
			हेक्टर	आर	सेन्टी आर
1	2	3	4	5	6
4. आदेसर (जारी...)	629/1		00	41	98
	629/4		00	34	91
	629/7		00	04	51

[ फा. सं. आर-31015/10/2002-ओ.आर-II ]

हरीश कुमार, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 17th July, 2002

S. O. 2357.— Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transportation of crude oil from crude oil terminal (COT) at Mundra Port in the State of Gujarat to Bathinda in the State of Punjab through Mundra - Bathinda pipeline, a pipeline should be laid by Guru Gobind Singh Refineries Limited (a subsidiary of Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Limited);

And whereas, it appears to the Central Government that for the purpose of the laying the said pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user (ROU) in the land under which the said pipeline is proposed to be laid, and which is described in the Schedule annexed to this notification;

Now, therefore, in exercise of powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Any person interested in the land described in the said Schedule may, within twenty-one days from the date on which the copies of the notification issued under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the said Act, as published in the Gazette of India, are made available to the general public, object in writing to the acquisition of the right of user therein or laying of the pipeline under the land to Shri D.K.PAREKH, Competent Authority, Mundra-Bathinda Crude Oil Pipeline, Guru Gobind Singh Refineries Limited (A subsidiary of Hindustan Petroleum Corporation Limited), P.B.No.43, Unit 2, HPCL., At & PO Khari Rohar, Tal. Gandhidham, Gujarat State.

**SCHEDULE****Taluka :- Rapar****District :- Kutchh****State :- Gujarat**

Name of Village	Survey No	Part if Any	ROU Area		
			Ha.	Ar.	Sq.mt.
1	2	3	4		
<b>1. Bhimasar</b>	944/1		00	08	50
	944/2		00	09	88
	945/1		00	02	72
	943/1		00	12	53
	943/2		00	11	62
	946		00	29	83
	947	P	00	29	76
	951/3	P	00	13	40
	938/1		00	26	43
	938/2		00	22	77
	938/3		00	09	25
	937		00	34	35
	921		00	62	92
	913/1		00	15	77
	913/2		00	05	41
	912/2		00	17	00
	912/3		00	22	03
	909/1		00	12	96
	909/2		00	33	62
	910		00	08	88
	908/2		00	18	63
	908/3		00	14	73
	907		00	14	91
	906		00	15	36
	Trowers 2220/1	P	00	04	05
	-		00	06	50
	Trowers 2220/1	P	00	00	69
	-		00	00	57
	Trowers 2220/1	P	00	19	47
	718	P	00	03	21



Taluka :- Rapar

District :- Kutchh

State :- Gujarat

Name of Village	Survey No	Part If Any	ROU Area		
			Ha.	Ar.	Sq.mt.
1	2	3	4		
1. Bhimasar (Contd...)	719		00	16	69
	Trowers 2220/1	P	00	06	40
	-		00	08	09
	Trowers 2220/1	P	00	02	65
	Trowers 2220/1	P	00	01	88
	720		00	25	36
	721		00	36	19
	722		00	29	17
	-		00	01	71
	795/2		00	03	75
	793		00	01	01
	Trowers 2220/1	P	00	29	40
	728/1	P	00	24	11
	728/2		00	30	78
	Trowers 2220/1	P	00	01	80
	-		00	03	18
	Trowers 2220/1	P	00	02	49
	729	P	00	20	00
	729	P	00	00	78
	Trowers 2220/1	P	00	00	32
	-		00	00	09
	Trowers 2220/1	P	00	05	51
	735/4		00	14	63
	Trowers 2220/1	P	00	58	94
	-		00	00	77
	Trowers 2220/1	P	00	08	80
	-		00	00	81
	Trowers 2220/1	P	00	09	45
	-		00	00	87
	Trowers 2220/1	P	00	11	04
	790/1		00	39	14
	-		00	00	86
		Cart Track			

Taluka :- Rapar

District :- Kutchh

State :- Gujarat

Name of Village	Survey No	Part if Any	ROU Area		
			Ha.	Ar.	Sq.mt.
1	2	3	4		
1. Bhimasar (Contd...)	Trowers 2220/1	P	00	31	67
	781/1		00	09	05
	781/2		00	04	07
	782	P	00	22	87
	Trowers 2220/1	P	00	43	30
	780	P	00	37	88
	779/1		00	07	16
	Trowers 2220/1	P	00	31	62
	809/1		00	09	15
	809/2		00	09	35
	810/1		00	21	13
	810/2		00	14	31
	810/3		00	15	99
	810/4		00	08	98
	Trowers 2220/1	P	00	12	64
	-		00	00	79
	Trowers 2220/1	P	00	03	43
	812/1	P	00	16	71
	814/1	P	00	18	31
	814/2		00	25	54
	814/3		00	21	08
	815/2		00	01	55
	819		00	33	01
	821	P	00	14	35
	820	P	00	12	05
	825		00	16	00
	822/1		00	04	33
	822/2		00	17	63
	826		00	47	17
	823		00	17	70
	824/1		00	07	19
	824/2		00	06	95
	824/3		00	08	37
	827/1		00	21	07

Taluka :- Rapar

District :- Kutchh

State :- Gujarat

Name of Village	Survey No	Part if Any	ROU Area		
			Ha.	Ar.	Sq.mt.
1	2	3	4		
1. Bhimasar (Contd...)	827/2	P	00	17	55
	827/3		00	15	23
	828/1	P	00	23	54
	828/2		00	13	94
	836/1	P	00	13	94
	836/3		00	12	42
	836/4		00	12	93
	829	P	00	17	46
	835/1	P	00	21	05
	835/2		00	03	10
	834/1		00	14	22
	834/3	P	00	07	04
	843/1		00	12	19
	843/2		00	13	63
	844		00	01	41
	845/1		00	01	93
	845/2		00	35	05
	845/3		00	22	26
	850/1		00	00	45
	851	P	00	00	11
	852/3		00	18	43
	852/2		00	01	63
	853/4		00	22	76
	853/3		00	05	30
	853/2		00	06	44
	855/2		00	07	41
	855/1		00	06	30
	856/1		00	16	82
	857/3		00	11	01
	857/2	P	00	22	12
	857/1		00	05	22
	841		00	03	86
	859		00	41	37

Taluka :- Rapar

District :- Kutchh

State :- Gujarat

Name of Village	Survey No	Part if Any	ROU Area		
			Ha.	Ar.	Sq.mt.
1	2	3	4		
1. Bhimasar (Contd...)	860/2		00	00	35
	860/1		00	20	17
	861/3		00	06	99
	861/2		00	21	79
	-	Nala	00	05	30
	Trowers 2220/1	P	00	11	09
	-	Cart Track	00	08	00
	Trowers 2220/1	P	00	25	82
	2191/1		00	07	38
	2191/2		00	24	49
	2190/2		00	04	76
	2190/1		00	25	74
	-	River	00	12	74
	2185/2	P	00	40	76
	2185/1		00	08	35
	2183/2	P	00	16	64
	2182		00	16	80
	-	Cart Track	00	05	17
	2180/1		00	08	00
	2179/4	P	00	04	23
	2179/3		00	14	01
	2179/2		00	05	26
	2179/1		00	09	81
	2174/3	P	00	00	13
	2178/1	P	00	15	40
	2175/2		00	09	86
	2173/1		00	13	01
	2167		00	13	07
	2169	P	00	25	32
	2161/2		00	01	96
	2161/3		00	07	91
	2161/4		00	08	37
	2162/1		00	06	09
	-	Cart Track	00	03	45

Taluka :- Rapar

District :- Kutchh

State :- Gujarat

Name of Village	Survey No	Part if Any	ROU Area		
			Ha.	Ar.	Sq.mt.
1	2	3	4		
1. Bhimasar (Contd...)	2154/2		00	10	29
	2154/3	P	00	12	07
	2153/2		00	03	71
	2152/1		00	25	19
	2152/2		00	01	36
	2141/2		00	09	13
	2146/1		00	14	97
	2146/2	P	00	14	80
	2143/1		00	12	49
	2143/2		00	12	39
	2144/1		00	13	38
	2144/2		00	12	30
	-	Cart Track	00	03	41
	2129/1		00	08	38
	2129/2		00	14	16
	2130/1	P	00	09	69
	2130/2	P	00	25	26
	-	Cart Track	00	02	64
	-	Nala	00	19	86
	-	Cart Track	00	01	24
	2125/1	P	00	13	70
	2122/2		00	15	80
	2122/3		00	17	90
	2121/2	P	00	14	08
	2121/3		00	15	53
	2123/3		00	05	41
	2119/1		00	09	97
	2119/2		00	00	11
	2117/2		00	13	89
	2116/1		00	32	96
	2116/2		00	04	32
	2115/1		00	24	35
	-	Cart Track	00	07	01
	2104/2		00	08	86

Taluka :- Rapar

District :- Kutchh

State :- Gujarat

Name of Village	Survey No	Part if Any	ROU Area		
			Ha.	Ar.	Sq.mt.
1	2	3	4		
1. Bhimasar (Contd...)	2105/1	P	00	29	58
	2105/2		00	32	79
	2106/1	P	00	33	90
	2106/2		00	17	03
	2106/3		00	02	19
	2106/4		00	09	23
	2107/1		00	23	81
	2107/2	P	00	25	14
	2107/3		00	08	86
	2110/1		00	06	51
	2211		00	13	46
	2210		00	06	16
	2209		00	03	85
	2056/1	P	00	13	15
	2056/2	P	00	14	31
	2055/8		00	17	84
	2055/7		00	04	19
	2055/6		00	08	09
	2055/4		00	06	56
	2058/3		00	01	10
	2058/2		00	19	50
	2058/1	P	00	10	87
	2054/6		00	10	77
	2054/4	P	00	04	85
	2054/5	P	00	21	48
	2054/3	P	00	06	20
	2059/7		00	04	87
	2053/6		00	17	97
	2053/5		00	14	30
	2052/3		00	16	46
	2052/2		00	15	49
	2052/5		00	19	76
	2052/1		00	12	91

Taluka :- Rapar

District :- Kutchh.

State :- Gujarat

Name of Village	Survey No	Part If Any	ROU Area		
			Ha.	Ar.	Sq.mt.
1	2	3	4		
1. Bhimasar (Contd...)	2051/3	P	00	00	96
	2051/2	P	00	14	15
	2050/2		00	15	84
	2050/3		00	16	80
	2049/4		00	21	09
	2049/3		00	06	31
	2049/2		00	31	56
	2049/1		00	05	28
	2048/2		00	00	14
	2048/1		00	25	41
	2046/2		00	22	02
	2045		00	15	40
	2044		00	14	20
	2043/1		00	30	21
	2041/1		00	19	40
	2041/2		00	00	36
	2040/2	P	00	82	42
	2039/1		00	17	14
	2038/5		00	01	83
	2038/4		00	06	45
	2038/3		00	05	27
	2038/2		00	09	91
	2037/4	P	00	19	44
	2037/2		00	00	08
	Trowers 2220/1	P	00	10	81
2. Lakhagarh	119		00	36	97
	Trowers 432	P	00	01	20
	97		00	30	18
	96		00	37	43
	94		00	15	95
	93/1		00	30	05
	93/2		00	19	48

Taluka :- Rapar

District :- Kutchh

State :- Gujarat

Name of Village	Survey No	Part if Any	ROU Area		
			Ha.	Ar.	Sq.mt.
1	2	3	4		
3. Bhangera - Jadupur	203		00	33	13
	201/1		00	00	86
	202/1		00	16	07
	202/2		00	11	16
	-	Cart Track	00	04	01
	212		00	22	34
	214/2		00	16	61
	214/1		00	31	53
	213	P	00	02	08
	215/2		00	11	48
	-	Nala	00	04	10
	225/2		00	12	85
	225/1		00	33	40
	224/2		00	01	11
	219/2		00	22	81
	218/4		00	24	20
	222/2		00	00	22
	220	P	00	09	09
	-	Cart Track	00	04	09
	183/1		00	09	53
	182		00	09	19
	181	P	00	11	26
	180		00	18	39
	-	Nala	00	05	51
	169		00	39	44
	Towers 241	P	00	05	45
	170/1	P	00	29	28
	171/1		00	19	16
	171/3		00	25	21
	171/4		00	19	92
	Towers 241	P	00	73	04
	142	P	00	44	91



Taluka :- Rapar

District :- Kutchh

State :- Gujarat

Name of Village	Survey No	Part if Any	ROU Area		
			Ha.	Ar.	Sq.mt.
1	2	3	4		
3. Bhangera - Jadupur (Contd...)	143/2		00	14	94
	143/1		00	03	47
	141		00	28	46
	140	P	00	01	87
	139		00	56	34
4. Adesar	664		00	43	12
	663		00	15	28
	665/1	P	00	53	91
	656	P	00	32	79
	651/1		00	37	16
	650		00	31	14
	649		00	23	36
	646		00	26	28
	645/1		00	13	46
	647	P	00	18	24
	645/3		00	32	77
	Trowers 771	P	}	09	93
	-				
	642		00	37	60
	643	P	00	21	42
	Trowers 771	P	}	11	18
	-				
	640/1		00	25	28
	Trowers 771	P	00	15	93
	641/1	P	00	60	20
	641/3		00	13	59
	-		00	06	95
	634/2		00	12	14
	634/1		00	26	02
	632		00	89	49
	Trowers 771	P	}	24	86
	-				
	631		00	14	14

Taluka :- Rapar

District :- Kutchh

State :- Gujarat

Name of Village	Survey No	Part if Any	ROU Area		
			Ha.	Ar.	Sq.mt.
1	2	3	4		
4. Adesar (Contd...)	629/1		00	41	98
	629/4		00	34	91
	629/7		00	04	51

[No.R-31015/10/2002-O.R-II]  
HARISH KUMAR, Under Secy.

**कोयला और खान मंत्रालय**  
( कोयला विभाग )

नई दिल्ली, 11 जुलाई, 2002

का. आ. 2358.— केन्द्रीय सरकार, कोयला धारक क्षेत्र (अर्जन और विकास) अधिनियम 1957 (1957 का 20) (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात उक्त अधिनियम कहा गया है) की धारा 4 की उपधारा (i) के अधीन जारी भारत के राजपत्र भाग-2, खंड-3, उपखंड (ii) तारीख 21 अप्रैल, 2001 में प्रकाशित भारत सरकार के तत्कालीन कोयला मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्यांक का.आ.806 तारीख 11, अप्रैल, 2001 द्वारा उस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट, परिक्षेत्र की भूमि में, जिसका माप 23.72 हेक्टर (लगभग) या 58.61 एकड़ (लगभग) है, कोयले का पूर्वेक्षण करने के अपने आशय की सूचना दी थी ।

और केन्द्रीय सरकार का यह समाधान हो गया है कि उक्त भूमि के भाग में कोयला अभिप्राप्य है ।

अतः अब केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 की उपधारा (i) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, इससे संलग्न अनुसूची में वर्णित 15.35 हेक्टर (लगभग) या 37.93 एकड़ (लगभग) माप की भूमि में खनिजों के खनन, खदान, बोर करने, उनकी खुदाई और तलाश करने, उन्हें प्राप्त करने, उन पर कार्य करने और उन्हें ले जाने के अधिकारों का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की सूचना देती है । .

**टिप्पण 1.** इस अधिसूचना के अन्तर्गत आने वाले क्षेत्र के रेखांक सं० सी.1(ई)III /जे./आर/688-0701 तारीख 19 जुलाई, 2001 का निरीक्षण कलक्टर चन्द्रपुर (महाराष्ट्र) के कार्यालय में या कोयला नियंत्रक, 1, काउंसिल हाउस स्ट्रीट, कोलकाता - 700001 के कार्यालय में या वेस्टर्न कोलफील्ड्स लिमिटेड (राजस्व विभाग) कोल ईस्टेट, सिविल लाइन्स, नागपुर - 440 001 (महाराष्ट्र) के कार्यालय में किया जा सकता है।

**टिप्पण 2 :** उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 8 के उपबंधों की ओर ध्यान आकृष्ट किया जाता है जिसमें निम्नलिखित उपबंध है।

### **8. अर्जन की बाबत आपत्तियां -**

(1) कोई व्यक्ति जो किसी भूमि में जिसकी बाबत धारा 7 के अधीन अधिसूचना निकाली गई है हितबद्ध है, अधिसूचना के निकाले जाने से तीस दिन के भीतर सम्पूर्ण भूमि या उसके किसी भाग या ऐसी भूमि में या उस पर के किन्हीं अधिकारों का अर्जन किए जाने के बारे में आपत्ति कर सकेगा।

**स्पष्टीकरण :-** इस धारा के अर्थान्तर्गत यह आपत्ति नहीं मानी जाएगी कि कोई व्यक्ति किसी भूमि में कोयला उत्पादन के लिए स्वयं खनन संक्रियाएँ करना चाहता है और ऐसी सक्रियाएँ केन्द्रीय सरकार या किसी अन्य व्यक्ति को नहीं करनी चाहिए।

(2) उपधारा (1) के अधीन प्रत्येक आपत्ति सक्षम प्राधिकारी को लिखित रूप में की जाएगी और सक्षम प्राधिकारी आपत्तिकर्ता को स्वयं सुने जाने का या विधि व्यवसायी द्वारा सुनवाई का अवसर देगा और ऐसी सभी आपत्तियों को सुनने के पश्चात और ऐसी अतिरिक्त जांच यदि कोई हो, करने के पश्चात जो वह आवश्यक समझता है, वह या तो धारा 7 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन अधिसूचित भूमि के या ऐसी भूमि में या उस पर के अधिकारों के संबंध में एक रिपोर्ट या ऐसी भूमि के विभिन्न टुकड़ों या ऐसी भूमि में या उस पर के अधिकारों के संबंध में आपत्तियों पर अपनी सिफारिशों और उसके द्वारा की गई कार्यवाही के अभिलेख सहित विभिन्न रिपोर्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार को उसके विनिश्चय के लिए देगा।

(3) इस धारा के प्रयोजनों के लिए वह व्यक्ति किसी भूमि में हितबद्ध समझा जाएगा जो प्रतिकर में हित का दावा करने का हकदार होता, यदि भूमि या ऐसी भूमि में या उस पर के अधिकार इस अधिनियम के अधीन अर्जित कर लिए जाते हैं।

**टिप्पण 3 :** केन्द्रीय सरकार ने कोयला नियंत्रक, 1, काउंसिल हाउस स्ट्रीट, कोलकाता अधिनियम के उपबंधों के अधीन अधिसूचना सं. तारीख द्वारा सक्षम प्राधिकारी के रूप में नियुक्त किया है।

**अनुसूची**  
**नांदगांव इनक्लाइन विस्तार ब्लॉक (फेज - II)**  
**चन्द्रपुर क्षेत्र**  
**जिला चन्द्रपुर (महाराष्ट्र)**

(रेखांक संख्यांक सी-1 (ई) III /जे.आर/688-0701 तारीख 19 जुलाई, 2001)

**खनन अधिकार**

क्रम सं	ग्राम का नाम	पटवारी सर्कल संख्या	तहसील	जिला	क्षेत्र हेक्टर में	टिप्पणियां
1.	बीसापुर	7	बल्लारपुर	चन्द्रपुर	7.26	भाग
2.	भिवकुंड	7	बल्लारपुर	चन्द्रपुर	8.09	भाग

कुल क्षेत्र : 15.35 हेक्टर (लगभग)

या

37.93 एकड़ (लगभग)

**ग्राम बीसापुर में अर्जित किए जाने वाले प्लॉटों के संख्यांक :**

458 भाग, 459/2, 488, नाला भाग

**ग्राम भिवकुंड में अर्जित किए जाने वाले प्लॉटों के संख्यांक :**

46 भाग, 47, 48, 49 भाग, 58 भाग, 60 भाग, 62 भाग, 63, 64 भाग, 65 भाग, 66 भाग, 67 भाग, 68, सड़क भाग

**सीमा वर्णन**

**क-ख** रेखा बिन्दु 'क' से आरम्भ होती है और विद्यमान पट्टाधृत सीमा के साथ-साथ ग्राम बीसापुर से होकर जाती है, प्लॉट संख्यांक 458 में से नाला पार करती है फिर ग्राम भिवकुंड के प्लॉट संख्यांक 62, 60, 64, 65 में से होकर आगे बढ़ती है, प्लॉट संख्यांक 58, 49 में से होकर सड़क पार करती है, और बिन्दु 'ख' पर मिलती है ।

**ख-ग** रेखा, ग्राम भिवकुंड के प्लॉट संख्यांक 49, 46 में से होकर जाती है, प्लॉट संख्यांक 66, 67, में से होकर सड़क पार करती है, फिर प्लॉट संख्यांक 68, 62 की बाहरी सीमा के साथ-साथ जाती है और और बिन्दु 'ग' पर मिलती है ।

**ग-क** रेखा, ग्राम भिवकुंड और बीसापुर की सम्मिलित ग्राम सीमा के साथ-साथ जाती है फिर ग्राम बीसापुर से होकर आगे बढ़ती है, तथा प्लॉट संख्यांक 459/2, 488, नाला की बाहरी सीमा के साथ-साथ जाती है और आरम्भिक बिन्दु 'क' पर मिलती है ।

[फा. सं. 43015/3/2001-पी.आर. आई डब्ल्यू]

संजय बहादुर, उप सचिव

**Ministry of Coal & Mines**  
( Department of Coal )

New Delhi, the 11th July, 2002

**S. O. 2358.**— Whereas by the notification of the Government of India in the then Ministry of Coal Number S.O. 806, dated the 11<sup>th</sup> April, 2001, issued under sub-section (1) of section 4 of the Coal Bearing Areas (Acquisition and Development) Act, 1957 (20 of 1957) (hereinafter referred to as the said Act) and published in Part – II, Section – 3, Sub-section (ii) of the Gazette of India, dated the 21<sup>st</sup> April, 2001, the Central Government gave notice of its intention to prospect for coal in 23.72 hectares (approximately) or 58.61 acres (approximately) of the lands in the locality specified in the Schedule annexed to that notification;

And whereas the Central Government is satisfied that coal is obtainable in a part of said lands;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 7 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby gives notice of its intention to acquire the rights to mine, quarry, bore, dig and search for win, work and carry away minerals in the lands measuring 15.35 hectares (approximately) or 37.93 acres (approximately) described in the Schedule appended hereto ;

Note 1            The plan bearing No.C-1(E) III/JR/688-0701, dated the 19<sup>th</sup> July, 2001 of the area covered by this notification may be inspected in the office of the Collector, Chandrapur (Maharashtra) or in the office of the Coal Controller, 1 Council House Street, Kolkata (Pin 700 001) or in the office of the Western Coalfields Limited (Revenue Department), Coal Estate, Civil Lines, Nagpur - 440 001 (Maharashtra).

Note 2            Attention is hereby invited to the provisions of section 8 of the said Act, which provides as follows :-

**“8.    Objections to acquisition -**

- (1)    Any person interested in any land in respect of which a notification under section 7 has been issued may within thirty days of the issue of the notification, object to the acquisition of the whole or any part of the land or of any rights in or over such land.

**Explanation -** It shall not be an objection within the meaning of this section for any person to say that he himself desires to undertake mining operations in the land for the production of coal and that such operations should not be undertaken by the Central Government or by any other person.

- (2) Every objection under sub-section (1) shall be made to the competent authority in writing and the competent authority shall give the objector an opportunity of being heard either in person or by a legal practitioner and shall, after hearing all such objections and after making such further inquiry, if any, as he thinks necessary, either make a report in respect of the land which has been notified under sub-section (1) of section 7 or of rights in or over such land, or make different reports in respect of different parcels of such land or of rights in or over such land, to the Central Government, containing his recommendations on the objections, together with the record of proceedings held by him, for the decision of that Government.
- (3) For the purpose of this section, a person shall be deemed to be interested in land who would be entitled to claim an interest in compensation if the land or any rights in or over such land were acquired under this Act."

Note 3 The Coal Controller, 1, Council House Street, Kolkata has been appointed by the Central Government vide notification number S.O. 2519 dated the 11<sup>th</sup> June, 1983 as the competent authority under the provisos of the Act.

### Schedule

#### **Nandgaon Incline Extension Block (Phase-II) Chandrapur Area District – Chandrapur (Maharashtra)**

(Plan No. C-1(E)III/JR/688-0701 dated the 19<sup>th</sup> July, 2001)

#### **Mining rights:**

Serial number	Name of Village	Patwari circle Number	Tahsil	District	Area in hectares	Remarks
1.	Visapur	7	Ballarpur	Chandrapur	7.26	Part
2.	Bhiokund	7	Ballarpur	Chandrapur	8.09	Part

Total area : 15.35 hectares

(approximately)

or

37.93 acres

(approximately)

#### **Plot numbers to be acquired in village Visapur :-**

458 part, 459/2, 488, Nallah part.

#### **Plot numbers to be acquired in village Bhiokund :-**

46 part, 47, 48, 49 part, 58 part, 60 part, 62 part, 63, 64 part, 65 part, 66 part, 67 part, 68, Road part.

**Boundary description :-**

- A-B : Line starts from point 'A' and passes through village Visapur along the existing lease hold boundary, crosses nallah in plot number 458 then proceeds through village Bhiokund in plot numbers 62, 60, 64, 65, crosses road, in plot numbers 58, 49 and meets at point 'B'.
- B-C : Line passes through village Bhiokund in plot numbers 49, 46, crosses road, in plot numbers 66, 67 then passes along the outer boundary of plot numbers 68, 62 and meets at point 'C'.
- C-A: Line passes along the common village boundary of villages Bhiokund and Visapur, then proceeds through village Visapur along the outer boundary of plot numbers 459/2, 488, nallah and meets at starting point 'A'.

[No. 43015/3/2001-PRI W.]  
SANJAY BAHADUR Dy. Secy.

**आदेश**

नई दिल्ली, 11 जुलाई, 2002

**का. आ. 2359.**— कोयला धारक क्षेत्र (अर्जन और विकास ) अधिनियम, 1957 (1957 का 20 ) (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त अधिनियम कहा गया है) की धारा 9 की उपधारा (i) के अधीन निकाली गई भारत सरकार के कोयला मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या का.आ. 769 (अ) तारीख 09 अगस्त, 2001 के, जो भारत के राजपत्र, असाधारण भाग 2, खंड 3, उपखंड (ii) , तारीख 09 अगस्त, 2001 में प्रकाशित होने पर, उक्त अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि और भूमि में या उस पर के अधिकार (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त भूमि कहा गया है ) उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन, सभी विल्लंगमों से मुक्त होकर, आत्यंतिक रूप से केन्द्रीय सरकार में निहित हो गए हैं ;

और, केन्द्रीय सरकार का यह समाधान हो गया है कि साउथ ईस्टर्न कोलफील्ड्स लि0, बिलासपुर , (छत्तीसगढ़ ) (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त कंपनी कहा गया है ), जोकि एक सरकारी कंपनी है, ऐसे निबंधनों और शर्तों का, जिन्हें केन्द्रीय सरकार इस निमित्त अधिरोपित करना उचित समझे, अनुपालन करने के लिए राजामंद है ;

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 11 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, यह निदेश देती है कि इस प्रकार निहित उक्त भूमि और उक्त भूमि में या उस पर के अधिकार, तारीख 09 अगस्त, 2001 से केन्द्रीय सरकार में इस प्रकार निहित बने रहने की बजाय, निम्नलिखित निबंधनों और शर्तों के अधीन रहते हुए, उक्त कंपनी में निहित हो जाएंगे, अर्थात् :-

- (1) कि उक्त कंपनी, उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंधों के अधीन अवधारित प्रतिकर , ब्याज, और वैसी ही मदों की बाबत किए गए सभी संदायों की केन्द्रीय सरकार को प्रतिपूर्ति करेगी ;

- (2) कि उक्त कंपनी द्वारा शर्त (1) के अधीन केन्द्रीय सरकार को संदेय रकमों का अवधारण करने के प्रयोजन के लिए एक अधिकरण का गठन किया जाएगा तथा ऐसे किसी अधिकरण और ऐसे अधिकरण की सहायता के लिए नियुक्त व्यक्तियों के संबंधों में उपगत सभी व्यय, उक्त कंपनी वहन करेगी और इस प्रकार, इस प्रकार निहित उक्त भूमि में या उस पर के अधिकारों के लिए या उनके संबंध में सभी विधिक कार्यवाहियों, जैसे अपील आदि की बाबत उपगत, सभी व्यय भी, उक्त कंपनी वहन करेगी ;
- (3) कि उक्त कंपनी, केन्द्रीय सरकार और उसके पदधारियों की, ऐसे किसी अन्य व्यय के संबंध में, जो इस प्रकार निहित उक्त भूमि में या उस पर के अधिकारों के बारे में, केन्द्रीय सरकार या उसके पदधारियों द्वारा या उनके विरुद्ध किन्हीं कार्यवाहियों के संबंध में आवश्यक हो, क्षतिपूर्ति करेगी,
- (4) कि उक्त कंपनी को, केन्द्रीय सरकार के पूर्व अनुमोदन के बिना, उक्त भूमि किसी अन्य व्यक्ति को अंतरित करने की शक्ति नहीं होगी; और
- (5) कि उक्त कंपनी ऐसे निदेशों और शर्तों का, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा, जब कभी आवश्यक हो, उक्त भूमि के विशिष्ट क्षेत्रों के लिए दिए जाएं या अधिरोपित की जाए, पालन करेगी ।

[ फा. सं. 43015/9/96-एल. एम. डब्ल्यू./पी.आर. आई. डब्ल्यू ]  
 संजय बहादुर, उप सचिव

*CRDER*

New Delhi, the 11th July, 2002

**S. O. 2359.**— Whereas by the notification on the Government of India, Ministry of Mines & Minerals, Department of Coal S.O. 769(E) dated the 9<sup>th</sup> August, 2001 in Part-II, Section 3, sub-section (ii) of Extra Ordinary Gazette of India, dated 9<sup>th</sup> August, 2001, issued under sub-section (1) of the section 4 of the Coal Bearing Areas (Acquisition and Development) Act, 1957 (20 of 1957) (hereinafter referred to as the said Act), the rights in or over the land described in the Schedule appended to the said notification (hereinafter referred to as the said rights) vested absolutely in the Central Government free from all encumbrances under sub-section (1) of section 10 of the said Act;

And whereas the Central Government is satisfied that the South Eastern Coalfields Limited, Bilaspur (Chhattisgarh), a Government Company, (hereinafter referred to as the Company), is willing to comply with such terms and conditions as the Central Government thinks fit to impose in this behalf.

Now, therefore, the exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 11 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby directs that the said rights in or over the land, so vested, shall, with effect from the 9<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2001 instead of continuing to so vest in the Central Government, vest in the said Company, subject to the following terms and conditions namely:-

- (1) That the said Company shall reimburse the Central Government all payments made in respect of compensation, interest, damages and the like, as determined under the provisions of the said Act;



- (2) That a tribunal shall be constituted for the purpose of determining the amounts payable to the Central Government by the said Company under condition (1), and all expenditure incurred in connection with any such tribunal and persons appointed to assist the tribunal shall be borne by the said Company and similarly, all expenditure incurred in respect of all legal proceedings like appeals etc., for or in connection with the rights in over the side lands, so vesting shall also be borne by the said Company.
- (3) That the said Company shall indemnify the Central Government of its Official against any other expenditure that may be necessary in connection with any proceedings by or against the Central Government or its official regarding the rights in or over the said lands so vesting.
- (4) That the company shall have no power to transfer the said lands to any other person without the previous approval of the Central Government; and
- (5) That the said Company shall abide by such directions and conditions as may be given or imposed by the Central Government for particular areas of the said lands, as and when necessary.

[No 43015/9/96-L S.W./P.R.I.W.]  
SANJAY BAHADUR Dy Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 11 जुलाई, 2002

**का. आ. 2360.**— केन्द्रीय सरकार ने कोयला धारक क्षेत्र (अर्जन एवं विकास) अधिनियम 1957 (1957 का 20) की धारा 4 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन जारी और भारत के राजपत्र, भाग II, खण्ड - 3, उप खण्ड (ii) तारीख 16 दिसम्बर 2000 में प्रकाशित भारत सरकार के कोयला मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्यांक का. आ. सं. 2723 तारीख 30 नवम्बर 2000 द्वारा उस अधिसूचना से संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट परिक्षेत्र जिसका माप 934.20 हेक्टर ( लगभग ) है, कोयले का पूर्वक्षण करने के अपने आशय की सूचना दी थी,

और केन्द्रीय सरकार का यह समाधान हो गया है कि उक्त भूमि में कोयला अभिप्राप्त है ।

अतः अब केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, इससे संलग्न अनुसूची में वर्णित 934.20 हेक्टर (लगभग) माप की उक्त भूमि का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की सूचना देती हैं ।

**टिप्पण 1:** इस अधिसूचना के अधीन आने वाले क्षेत्र के नक्सा सं. ई.सी.एल./कंवीए/एलए/के डीपी/2001 तारीख 31 मार्च 2001 को निरीक्षण उपायुक्त, जिला बांकुड़ा (प.बंगाल) के कार्यालय में या कोयला नियंत्रक, 1, काउंसिल हाउस स्ट्रीट, कोलकाता 700001 के कार्यालय में या निदेशक (तकनीकी) योजना और परियोजना, ईस्टर्न कोलफील्ड्स लि. सेंकटोरिया, डाकघर - दिसेरगढ़, जिला - बर्दमान (प. बंगाल) के कार्यालय में किया जा सकता है ।

टिप्पण 2: उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 8 के उपबन्धों की ओर ध्यान आकृष्ट किया जाता है, जिसमें निम्नलिखित उपबन्ध है:—

**" 8 अर्जन के प्रति आक्षेप" :-**

(1) कोई व्यक्ति जो किसी भूमि में जिसकी बाबत धारा 7 के अधीन अधिसूचना निकाली गई है, हितवद्ध है, अधिसूचना के निकाले जाने से तीस दिन के भीतर सम्पूर्ण भूमि या उसके किसी भाग या ऐसी भूमि में या उस पर के किन्हीं अधिकारों का अर्जन किए जाने के बारे में आपत्ति कर सकेगा ।

**स्पष्टीकरण :-** इस धारा के अन्तर्गत यह आपत्ति नहीं मानी जायेगी कि कोई व्यक्ति किसी भूमि में कोयला उत्पादन के लिये स्वयं खनन संक्रियाएं केन्द्रीय सरकार या किसी अन्य व्यक्ति को नहीं करनी चाहिए ।

(2) उपधारा (1) के अधीन प्रत्येक आपत्ति सक्षम अधिकारी आपत्तिकर्ता को स्वयं सुने जाने का या बिधि व्यवसायी द्वारा सुनवाई का अवसर देगा और ऐसी सभी आपत्तियों को सुनने के पश्चात् और ऐसी अतिरिक्त जांच यदि कोई हो, करने के पश्चात् जो वह आवश्यक समझता है वह या तो धारा 7 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन अधिसूचित भूमि के या ऐसी भूमि में या उस पर के अधिकारों के संबंध में एक रिपोर्ट या ऐसी भूमि के विभिन्न टुकड़ों या ऐसी भूमि में या उस पर के अधिकारों के संबंध में आपत्तियों पर अपनी सिफारिशों और उसके द्वारा की गई कार्यावाही के अभिलेख सहित विभिन्न रिपोर्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार को उसके विनिश्चय के लिए देगा ।

(3) इस धारा के प्रयोजनों के लिए वह व्यक्ति किसी भूमि में हितवद्ध समझा जाएगा जो प्रतिकर में हित का दावा करने का हकदार होता यदि भूमि या किसी ऐसी भूमि में या उस पर के अधिकार इस अधिनियम के अधीन अर्जित कर लिए जाते हैं ।

टिप्पण 3: - केन्द्रीय सरकार ने कोयला नियंत्रक, 1 काउंसिल हाउस स्ट्रीट, कोलकाता - 700001 को उक्त अधिनियम के अधीन अधिसूचना सं. का.आ.2520 तारीख 11 जून, 1983 द्वारा सक्षम प्राधिकारी नियुक्त किया है ।

## अनुसूची

कालिदासपुर ब्लॉक (रानीगंज कोयलाखल), सतग्राम क्षेत्र, बाँकुड़ा जिला(प. बंगाल)

क्रम सं०	मौजा/ग्राम का नाम	थाना सं०	थाना	जिला	क्षेत्र हेक्टेयर हैं(अनुमानतः)	टिप्पणियां
1	भारा	1	मेजिया	बाँकुड़ा	176.58	भाग
2	भुलुई	6	मेजिया	बाँकुड़ा	69.00	भाग
3	खिराईतोड़	12	मेजिया	बाँकुड़ा	20.00	भाग
4	जोटश्रीराम	14	मेजिया	बाँकुड़ा	188.00	भाग
5	बांसकुडी	4	मेजिया	बाँकुड़ा	29.27	पुरा
6	जोरसा	18	मेजिया	बाँकुड़ा	5.00	भाग
7	वेनाकनाली	5	मेजिया	बाँकुड़ा	45.57	पुरा
8	अर्धाग्राम	7	मेजिया	बाँकुड़ा	40.00	भाग
9	कालिकापुर	3	मेजिया	बाँकुड़ा	128.78	पुरा
10	कालीदासपुर	2	मेजिया	बाँकुड़ा	90.00	भाग
11	जुगीबाग	15	मेजिया	बाँकुड़ा	82.00	भाग
12	साहेबडागां	45	सालतोरा	बाँकुड़ा	20.00	भाग
13	घुसरा	13	मेजिया	बाँकुड़ा	40.00	भाग
कुल -	-				934.20 हेक्टेयर	(अनुमानतः)

1. मौजा - भारा थाना संख्या - 1, थाना - मेजिया में अर्जित किये जाने वाले प्लॉट ।

2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 36/3051, 36/3079. 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 84/2985, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 90/2986, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 99/1615, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137(भाग), 138(भाग), 139(भाग), 140(भाग), 141, 142, 143(भाग), 144(भाग), 213(भाग), 214(भाग), 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227(भाग), 230(भाग), 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 309/2992, 309/2993, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405(भाग), 408(भाग), 409, 410, 411(भाग), 412(भाग), 427(भाग), 428(भाग), 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 443/2996, 443/2997, 443/2998(भाग), 443/2999(भाग), 444, 445, 446, 447(भाग), 448(भाग), 449, 450(भाग), 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496, 497, 498, 498/3042, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 541/3000, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 555/1611, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 634/3003, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 652/1612, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657, 658, 659, 660, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669,

670, 671, 672, 673, 674, 675, 676, 677, 678, 679, 680, 681, 682, 683, 684, 685, 686, 687, 688, 689, 690, 690/3004, 691, 692, 693, 694, 695, 696, 697, 698, 699, 700, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 708/3005, 709, 710, 711, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722, 723, 724, 725, 726, 727, 728, 729, 730, 731, 732, 733, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 743/3008, 744, 745, 746, 747, 748, 749, 750, 751, 752, 753, 754, 755, 756, 757, 758, 759, 760, 761, 762, 763, 764, 765, 766, 767, 768, 769, 770, 771, 772, 773, 774, 775, 776, 777, 778, 779, 780, 781, 782, 783, 784, 785, 786, 787, 788, 789, 790, 791, 792, 793, 794, 795, 796, 797, 798, 799, 800, 801, 802, 803, 804, 805, 806, 807, 808, 809, 810, 811, 812, 813, 814, 815, 816, 817, 818, 819, 820, 821, 822, 823, 824, 825, 826, 827, 828, 829, 830, 831, 832, 833, 834, 835, 836, 837, 838, 839, 840, 841, 842, 843, 844, 845, 846, 847, 848, 849, 850, 851, 852, 853, 854, 855, 856, 857, 858, 859, 860, 861, 862, 863, 864, 865, 866, 867, 868, 869, 870, 871, 872, 873, 874, 875, 876, 877, 878, 879, 880, 881, 882, 883, 884, 885, 886, 887, 888, 889, 890, 891, 892, 893, 894, 895, 896, 897, 898, 899, 900, 901, 902, 903, 904, 905, 906, 907, 908, 909, 910, 911, 912, 913, 914, 915, 916, 917, 918, 919, 920, 921, 922, 923, 924, 924/3011, 924/3012, 925, 926, 927, 928, 929, 930, 931, 932, 933, 934, 935, 936, 937, 938, 939, 940, 941, 942, 943, 944, 945, 946, 947, 948, 949, 950, 951, 952, 953, 954, 955, 956, 957, 958, 959, 960, 961, 962, 963, 964, 965, 966, 967, 968, 969, 970, 971, 972, 973, 974, 975, 976, 977, 978, 979, 980, 981, 982, 983, 984, 984/3013, 985, 986, 987, 988, 989, 990, 991, 992, 993, 994, 995, 996, 997, 998, 999, 1000, 1001, 1002, 1003, 1004, 1005, 1006, 1007, 1008, 1009, 1010, 1011, 1012, 1013, 1014, 1015, 1016, 1017, 1018, 1019, 1020, 1021, 1022, 1023, 1024, 1025, 1026, 1027, 1028, 1029, 1030, 1031, 1032, 1033, 1034, 1035, 1036, 1036/1616, 1037, 1038, 1039, 1040, 1041, 1042, 1043, 1044, 1045, 1046, 1047, 1048, 1049, 1050, 1051, 1052, 1053, 1054, 1055, 1056, 1057, 1058, 1059, 1060, 1061, 1062, 1063, 1064, 1065, 1066, 1067, 1068, 1069, 1070, 1071, 1072, 1073, 1074, 1075, 1076, 1077, 1078, 1079, 1080, 1081, 1082, 1083, 1084, 1085, 1086, 1087, 1088, 1089, 1090, 1091, 1092, 1093, 1094, 1095, 1096, 1097, 1098, 1099, 1100, 1101, 1102, 1103, 1104, 1105, 1106, 1107, 1108, 1109, 1110, 1111, 1112, 1113, 1114, 1115, 1116, 1117, 1118, 1119, 1120, 1121, 1122, 1123, 1124, 1125, 1126, 1127, 1128, 1129, 1130, 1131, 1132, 1133, 1134, 1135, 1136, 1137, 1138, 1139, 1140, 1141, 1142, 1143, 1144, 1145, 1146, 1147, 1148, 1149, 1150, 1151, 1152, 1153, 1154, 1155, 1156, 1157, 1158, 1159, 1160, 1161, 1161/3014, 1162, 1163(भाग), 1164, 1165, 1166, 1167, 1168, 1169, 1170, 1171, 1172, 1173, 1174, 1175, 1176, 1177, 1178, 1179, 1180, 1181, 1182, 1183, 1184, 1185, 1186, 1187, 1188, 1189, 1190, 1191, 1192, 1193, 1194, 1195, 1196, 1197, 1198, 1199, 1200, 1201, 1202, 1203, 1204, 1205, 1206, 1207, 1208, 1209, 1210, 1211, 1212, 1213, 1214, 1215, 1216, 1217, 1218, 1219, 1220, 1221, 1222, 1223, 1224, 1225, 1226, 1227, 1228, 1229, 1230, 1231, 1232, 1233, 1234, 1235, 1236, 1237, 1238, 1239, 1240, 1241, 1242, 1243, 1244, 1245, 1246, 1247, 1248, 1249, 1250, 1251, 1252, 1253, 1254, 1255, 1256, 1257, 1258, 1259, 1260, 1261, 1262, 1263, 1264, 1265, 1266, 1267, 1268, 1269, 1270, 1271, 1272, 1273, 1274, 1275,

1275/3015, 1276, 1277, 1278, 1279, 1280, 1281, 1282, 1283, 1284, 1285, 1286,  
1287, 1288, 1289, 1290, 1291, 1292, 1293, 1294, 1295, 1296, 1297, 1298, 1299,  
1300, 1301, 1302, 1303, 1304, 1305, 1306, 1307, 1308, 1309, 1310, 1311, 1312,  
1313, 1314, 1315, 1316, 1317, 1318, 1319, 1320, 1321, 1322, 1323, 1324, 1325,  
1326, 1327, 1328, 1329, 1330, 1331, 1332, 1333, 1334, 1335, 1336, 1337, 1338,  
1339, 1340, 1341, 1342, 1343, 1344, 1345, 1346, 1347, 1348, 1349, 1350, 1351,  
1352, 1353, 1354, 1355, 1356, 1357, 1358, 1359, 1360, 1361, 1362, 1363, 1364,  
1365, 1366, 1367, 1368, 1369, 1370, 1371, 1372, 1373, 1374, 1375, 1376, 1377,  
1378, 1379, 1380, 1381, 1382, 1383, 1384, 1385, 1386, 1386/3016, 1387, 1388, 1389,  
1390, 1391, 1392, 1393, 1394, 1395, 1396, 1397, 1398, 1399, 1400, 1401, 1402,  
1403, 1404, 1405, 1406, 1407, 1408, 1409, 1410, 1411, 1412, 1413, 1414, 1415,  
1416, 1417, 1418, 1419, 1420, 1421, 1422, 1423, 1424, 1425, 1426, 1427, 1428,  
1429, 1430, 1431, 1432, 1433, 1434, 1435, 1436, 1437, 1438, 1439, 1440, 1441,  
1442, 1443, 1444, 1445, 1446, 1447, 1448, 1449, 1450, 1451, 1452, 1453, 1454,  
1455, 1456, 1457, 1458, 1459, 1460, 1461, 1462, 1463, 1464, 1465, 1466, 1467,  
1468, 1469, 1470, 1471, 1472, 1473, 1474, 1475, 1476, 1477, 1478, 1479, 1480,  
1481, 1482, 1483, 1484, 1485, 1486, 1487, 1488, 1489, 1490, 1491, 1492, 1493,  
1494, 1495, 1496, 1497, 1498, 1499, 1500, 1501, 1502, 1503, 1504, 1505, 1506,  
1507, 1508, 1509, 1510, 1511, 1512, 1513, 1514, 1515, 1516, 1517, 1518, 1519,  
1520, 1521, 1522, 1523, 1524, 1525, 1526, 1527, 1528, 1529, 1530, 1531, 1532,  
1533, 1534, 1535, 1536, 1537, 1538, 1539, 1540, 1541, 1542, 1543, 1544, 1545,  
1546, 1547, 1548, 1549, 1550, 1551, 1552, 1553, 1554, 1555, 1556, 1557, 1558,  
1559, 1560, 1561, 1562, 1563, 1564, 1564/3020, 1564/3021, 1565, 1566, 1567, 1568,  
1569, 1570, 1571, 1572, 1573, 1574, 1575, 1576, 1577, 1578, 1579, 1580, 1581,  
1582, 1583, 1584, 1585, 1586, 1587, 1588, 1589, 1590, 1591, 1592, 1593, 1594,  
1595, 1596, 1597, 1598, 1599, 1600, 1601, 1602, 1603, 1604, 1605, 1606, 1607,  
1608, 1609, 1610, 1610/3009, 1610, 3010, 1617, 1618, 1619, 1620, 1621, 1622, 1623,  
1624, 1625, 1626, 1627, 1628, 1628/3023, 1631, 1632, 1633, 1634, 1635, 1636, 1637,  
1638, 1639, 1640, 1641, 1642, 1643, 1644, 1645, 1646, 1647, 1648, 1649, 1650,  
1651, 1652, 1653, 1654, 1655, 1656, 1657, 1658, 1659, 1660, 1661, 1662, 1663,  
1664, 1665, 1666, 1667, 1668, 1669, 1670, 1671, 1672, 1673, 1674, 1674/3024, 1675,  
1676, 1677, 1678, 1679, 1680, 1681, 1682, 1683, 1684, 1685, 1686, 1687, 1688,  
1689, 1690, 1691, 1692, 1693, 1694, 1695, 1696, 1697, 1698, 1699, 1700, 1701,  
1702, 1703, 1704, 1705, 1706, 1707, 1708, 1709, 1710, 1711, 1712, 1713, 1714,  
1715, 1716, 1717, 1718, 1719, 1720, 1721, 1722, 1723, 1724, 1725, 1726, 1727,  
1728, 1729, 1730, 1731, 1732, 1733, 1734, 1735, 1736, 1737, 1738, 1739, 1740,  
1741, 1742, 1743, 1744, 1745, 1746, 1747, 1748, 1749, 1750, 1751, 1752, 1753,  
1754, 1755, 1756, 1757, 1758, 1759, 1760, 1761, 1762, 1763, 1764, 1765, 1766,  
1767, 1768, 1769, 1770, 1771, 1772, 1773, 1774, 1775, 1776, 1777, 1778, 1779,  
1780, 1781, 1782, 1783, 1784, 1785, 1786, 1787, 1788, 1789, 1790, 1791, 1792,  
1793, 1794, 1795, 1796, 1797, 1798, 1799, 1800, 1801, 1802, 1803, 1804, 1805,  
1806, 1807, 1808, 1809, 1810, 1811, 1812, 1813, 1815, 1816, 1817, 1817/3040, 1818,  
1821, 1822, 1823, 1824, 1825, 1826, 1827, 1828, 1829, 1830, 1831, 1832, 1833,

1834, 1835, 1836, 1837, 1838, 1839, 1840, 1841, 1842, 1843, 1844, 1845, 1846,  
 1847, 1848, 1849, 1850, 1851, 1852, 1853, 1854, 1855, 1856, 1857, 1858, 1859,  
 1860, 1861, 1862, 1863, 1864, 1865, 1866, 1867, 1868, 1869, 1870, 1871, 1872,  
 1873, 1874, 1875, 1876, 1877, 1878, 1879, 1880, 1881, 1882, 1883, 1884, 1885,  
 1886, 1887, 1888, 1888/3025, 1889, 1890, 1891, 1892, 1893, 1894, 1895, 1896, 1897,  
 1898, 1899, 1900, 1901, 1902, 1903, 1904, 1905, 1906, 1907, 1908, 1909, 1910,  
 1911, 1912, 1913, 1914, 1915, 1916, 1917, 1918, 1919, 1920, 1921, 1922, 1923,  
 1924, 1925, 1926, 1927, 1928, 1929, 1930, 1930/3043, 1931, 1932, 1933, 1933/3044,  
 1934, 1934/3045, 1935, 1935/3046, 1936, 1937, 1937/3047, 1938, 1939, 1940, 1941,  
 1942, 1943, 1944, 1945, 1946, 1947, 1948, 1949, 1950, 1951, 1952, 1953, 1954,  
 1955, 1956, 1957, 1958, 1959, 1960, 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964, 1965, 1966, 1967,  
 1968, 1969, 1970, 1971, 1972, 1973, 1974, 1975, 1976, 1977, 1978, 1979, 1979/3026,  
 1979/3027, 1979/3028, 1979/3029, 1980, 1981, 1982, 1983, 1983/3048, 1984, 1985,  
 1986, 1987, 1988, 1989, 1990, 1991, 1992, 1993, 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997, 1998,  
 1999, 2000, 2000/3076, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010,  
 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023,  
 2024, 2025, 2026, 2027, 2028, 2029, 2030, 2031, 2032, 2033, 2034, 2035, 2036,  
 2037, 2038, 2039, 2040, 2041, 2042, 2043, 2044, 2045, 2046, 2047, 2048, 2049,  
 2050, 2051, 2052, 2053, 2054, 2055, 2056, 2057, 2058, 2059, 2060, 2061, 2062,  
 2063, 2064, 2065, 2066, 2067, 2068, 2069, 2070, 2071, 2072, 2073, 2074, 2075,  
 2076, 2077, 2078, 2079, 2080, 2081, 2082, 2083, 2084, 2085, 2086, 2087, 2088,  
 2089, 2090, 2091, 2092, 2092/3070, 2093, 2094, 2095, 2096, 2097, 2098, 2099, 2100,  
 2101, 2102, 2103, 2104, 2105, 2106, 2107, 2108, 2109, 2110, 2111, 2112, 2113,  
 2114, 2115, 2116, 2117, 2118, 2119, 2120, 2121, 2122, 2123, 2124, 2125, 2126,  
 2127, 2128, 2129, 2130, 2131, 2132, 2133, 2134, 2135, 2136, 2137, 2138, 2139,  
 2140, 2141, 2142, 2143, 2144, 2145, 2146, 2147, 2148, 2149, 2150, 2151, 2152,  
 2153, 2154, 2155, 2156, 2157, 2158, 2159, 2160, 2161, 2162, 2163, 2164, 2165,  
 2166, 2167, 2168, 2169, 2170, 2171, 2172, 2173, 2174, 2175, 2176, 2177, 2178,  
 2179, 2180, 2181, 2182, 2183, 2184, 2185, 2186, 2187, 2188, 2189, 2190, 2191,  
 2192, 2193, 2194, 2195, 2196, 2197, 2198, 2199, 2200, 2201, 2202, 2203, 2204,  
 2205, 2206, 2207, 2208, 2209, 2210, 2211, 2212, 2213, 2214, 2215, 2216, 2217,  
 2218, 2219, 2220, 2221, 2222, 2223, 2224, 2225, 2226, 2227, 2228, 2229, 2230,  
 2231, 2232, 2233, 2234, 2235, 2235/3071, 2236, 2237, 2238, 2239, 2240, 2241, 2242,  
 2243, 2244, 2245, 2246, 2247, 2248, 2249, 2250, 2251, 2252, 2253, 2254, 2255,  
 2256, 2257, 2258, 2259, 2260, 2261, 2262, 2263, 2264, 2265, 2266, 2267, 2268,  
 2269, 2270, 2271, 2272, 2273, 2274, 2275, 2276, 2277, 2278, 2279, 2280, 2281,  
 2282, 2283, 2284, 2285, 2286, 2287, 2288, 2289, 2290, 2291, 2292, 2293, 2294,  
 2295, 2296, 2297, 2298, 2299, 2300, 2301, 2302, 2303, 2304, 2305, 2306, 2307,  
 2308, 2309, 2310, 2311, 2312, 2313, 2314, 2315, 2315/3034, 2316, 2317, 2318, 2319,  
 2320, 2321, 2322, 2323, 2324, 2325, 2326, 2327, 2328, 2329, 2330, 2331, 2332,  
 2333, 2334, 2335, 2336, 2337, 2338, 2339, 2340, 2341, 2342, 2343, 2344, 2345,  
 2346, 2347, 2348, 2349, 2350, 2351, 2352, 2353, 2354, 2355, 2356, 2357, 2358,  
 2359, 2360, 2361, 2362, 2363, 2364, 2365, 2366, 2367, 2368, 2369, 2370, 2371,

2372, 2373, 2374, 2375, 2376, 2377, 2378, 2379, 2380, 2381, 2382, 2383, 2384, 2385, 2386, 2387, 2388, 2389, 2390, 2391, 2392, 2393, 2394, 2395, 2396, 2397, 2398, 2398/3052, 2398/3053, 2398/3054, 2398/3055, 2398/3056, 2398/3057, 2398/3058, 2399, 2400, 2401, 2402, 2403, 2404, 2405, 2406, 2407, 2407/3059, 2408, 2409, 2410, 2411, 2412, 2413, 2414, 2415, 2416, 2416/3060, 2416/3061, 2416/3062, 2416/3063, 2417, 2418, 2419, 2420, 2421, 2422, 2423, 2424, 2425, 2426, 2427, 2428, 2429, 2430, 2431, 2432, 2433, 2434, 2435, 2436, 2437, 2438, 2439, 2440, 2441, 2442, 2443, 2444, 2445, 2446, 2447, 2448, 2449, 2450, 2451, 2452, 2453, 2454, 2455, 2456, 2457, 2458, 2459, 2460, 2461, 2462, 2463, 2464, 2465, 2466, 2467, 2468, 2469, 2470, 2471, 2472, 2473, 2474, 2475, 2476, 2477, 2478, 2479, 2480, 2481, 2482, 2483, 2484, 2485, 2486, 2487, 2488, 2489, 2490, 2491, 2492, 2493, 2494, 2495, 2496, 2497, 2498, 2499, 2500, 2501, 2502, 2503, 2504, 2505, 2506, 2507, 2508, 2509, 2510, 2511, 2512, 2513, 2514, 2515, 2516, 2517, 2518, 2519, 2520, 2521, 2522, 2523, 2524, 2525, 2526, 2527, 2528, 2529, 2530, 2530/2984, 2531, 2532, 2533, 2534, 2535, 2536, 2537, 2539, 2540, 2541, 2542, 2543, 2544, 2545, 2546, 2547, 2548, 2549, 2550, 2551, 2552, 2553, 2554, 2555, 2556, 2557, 2558, 2559, 2560, 2561, 2562, 2563, 2564, 2565, 2566, 2567, 2568, 2569, 2570, 2571, 2572, 2573, 2574, 2575, 2576, 2577, 2578, 2579, 2580, 2581, 2582, 2583, 2584, 2585, 2586, 2587, 2588, 2589, 2590, 2591, 2592, 2593, 2594, 2595, 2596, 2597, 2598, 2599, 2600, 2601, 2602, 2603, 2604, 2605, 2606, 2607, 2608, 2609, 2610, 2611, 2612, 2613, 2614, 2615, 2616, 2617, 2618, 2619, 2620, 2621, 2622, 2623, 2624(भाग), 2625, 2626, 2627, 2628, 2629, 2630, 2639(भाग), 2641(भाग), 2642, 2643, 2644, 2645, 2646, 2647, 2648, 2654(भाग), 2990(भाग).

2. मौजा - भुलुई थाना संख्या-6, थाना - मेजिया में अर्जित किये जाने वाले प्लॉट ।

1, 2, 3, 3/512, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 17/513, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 22/514, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 58/511, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 96/515, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 217/521, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302,



303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 440/516, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 445/517, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 455/518, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501(भाग), 502, 503, 504(भाग), 505(भाग), 506(भाग), 507(भाग).

3. मौजा - खिराईतोड़, थाना संख्या - 12, थाना - मेजिया में अर्जित किये जाने वाले प्लॉट ।

1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48(भाग), 48/2236, 59(भाग), 60(भाग), 61, 62, 63(भाग), 64(भाग), 215(भाग), 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 227/2245, 228, 229(भाग), 230(भाग), 255(भाग), 256(भाग), 259(भाग), 260(भाग), 262(भाग), 262/2237(भाग), 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278(भाग), 279(भाग), 280, 281, 282(भाग), 291(भाग), 292(भाग), 293(भाग), 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308(भाग), 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317(भाग), 318(भाग), 319(भाग), 320(भाग), 329(भाग), 330(भाग), 331(भाग).

4. मौजा - जोटश्रीराम, थाना संख्या - 14, थाना - मेजिया में अर्जित किये जाने वाले प्लॉट ।

1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 17/1214, 17/1215, 17/1216, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 99/1179, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 119/1178, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 207/1203, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 227/1217, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241,

242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 288/1180, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299(भाग), 301(भाग), 303(भाग), 303/1182, 303/1183, 303/1184(भाग), 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315(भाग), 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 323/1227, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 332/1187, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 375/1221, 375/1218, 375/1219, 375/1220, 376, 376/1222, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, ----- 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 452/1229, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 477/1181, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 532/1204, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 554/1090, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 571/1188, 572, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 585/1189, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602, 603, 603/1190, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657, 658, 659, 660, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669, 670, 671, 672, 673, 674, 675, 676, 677, 678, 679, 680, 681, 682, 683, 684, 685, 686, 687, 688, 689, 690, 691, 692, 693, 694, 695, 696, 697, 698, 699, 700, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722, 723, 724, 725, 726, 727, 728, 729, 729/1191, 730, 731, 732, 733, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 738/1195, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 744, 745, 746, 747, 748, 749, 750, 751, 752, 753, 754, 755, 756, 757, 758, 759, 760, 761, 762, 763, 764, 765, 766, 767, 768, 769, 770, 770/1192, 771, 772, 773, 774, 775, 776, 777, 778, 779, 780, 781, 782, 783, 784, 785, 786, 786/1194, 787, 788, 788/1193, 789, 790, 791, 792, 793, 794, 795, 796, 797, 798, 799, 800, 801, 802, 803, 804, 805, 806, 807, 808, 808/1196, 809, 810, 811, 812, 813, 814, 815, 816, 817, 818, 819, 820, 821, 822, 822/1197, 823, 824, 825, 826, 827, 828, 829, 830, 831, 832, 833, 834, 835, 836, 837, 838, 839, 840, 841, 842, 843, 844, 845, 846, 847, 848, 849, 850, 850/1198, 851, 852, 853, 854, 855, 855/1175, 856, 857, 858, 859, 860, 861, 862, 863, 864, 865, 866, 867, 868, 869, 870, 871, 872, 873, 874, 875, 876, 877, 878, 879, 880, 881, 882, 883, 884, 885,

886, 887, 888, 889, 890, 891, 892, 893, 894, 895, 896, 897, 898, 899, 900, 901, 902, 903, 904, 905, 906, 907, 908, 909, 910, 911, 912, 913, 914, 915, 916, 917, 918, 919, 920, 921, 922, 923, 924, 925, 926, 927, 928, 929, 930, 931, 932, 933, 934, 935, 936, 937, 938, 939, 940, 941, 942, 943, 944, 945, 946, 947, 948, 949, 950, 951, 952, 953, 954, 955, 956, 957, 958(भाग), 959(भाग), 960, 961, 962, 963, 964, 965, 966, 967, 968, 969, 970(भाग), 975/1209, 994(भाग), 995(भाग), 996, 997(भाग), 998(भाग), 999(भाग), 1000, 1001, 1002, 1003, 1004, 1005, 1006, 1007, 1008, 1009, 1010, 1011, 1012, 1013, 1014, 1015, 1016, 1017, 1018, 1019, 1020, 1021, 1022, 1023, 1024, 1025, 1026, 1027, 1028, 1029, 1030, 1031, 1032, 1033, 1034, 1035, 1036, 1037, 1038, 1039, 1040, 1041, 1042, 1043, 1044, 1045, 1046, 1047, 1048, 1049, 1050, 1051, 1052, 1053, ————— 1054, 1055, 1056, 1057, 1058, 1059, 1060, 1061, 1062, 1063, 1064, 1065, 1066, 1067, 1068, 1068/1199, 1068/1200, 1069, 1070, 1071, 1072, 1073, 1074, 1075, 1076, 1077, 1078, 1079, 1080, 1081, 1082, 1083, 1084, 1085, 1086, 1087, 1088, 1089, 1090, 1091, 1092, 1093, 1094, 1095, 1096, 1097, 1098, 1099, 1100, 1101(भाग), 1103, 1104, 1105, 1106(भाग), 1107, 1108, 1109, 1110, 1111, 1112, 1113, 1114(भाग), 1115(भाग), 1119(भाग), 1125(भाग), 1126(भाग), 1127(भाग), 1133, 1134(भाग), 1135(भाग), 1172(भाग).

5. मौजा - बांसकुड़ी, थाना संख्या - 4, थाना - मेजिया में अर्जित किये जाने वाले प्लॉट ।

1, 1/118, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 8/119, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 24/1209, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 61/117, 62, 62/121, 62/122, 62/123, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 92/124, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 111/125, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116.

6. मौजा - जोरसा, थाना संख्या - 18, थाना - मेजिया में अर्जित किये जाने वाले प्लॉट ।

537(भाग), 538, 539, 540(भाग), 541(भाग), 542, 543(भाग), 544(भाग), 546(भाग), 555(भाग), 556(भाग), 557(भाग), 558(भाग), 561(भाग).

7. मौजा - बेनाकानाली, थाना संख्या - 5, थाना - मेजिया में अर्जित किये जाने वाले प्लॉट ।

1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 109/149, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148.

8. मौजा - अर्धाग्राम, थाना संख्या - 7, थाना - मेजिया में अर्जित किये जाने वाले प्लॉट ।

379(भाग), 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 388, 389(भाग), 390(भाग), 391(भाग), 392(भाग), 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460(भाग), 461(भाग), 464(भाग), 465(भाग), 467(भाग), 468(भाग), 476(भाग), 477, 478, 479(भाग), 480(भाग), 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496, 497, 498, 499, 500, 500/1346, 500/1347, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 531/1326, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543(भाग), 544(भाग), 549(भाग), 550(भाग), 551, 552(भाग), 552/1327, 556(भाग), 557(भाग), 558(भाग), 559, 560, 561, 562(भाग), 563(भाग), 564(भाग), 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570(भाग), 575(भाग), 576(भाग), 577(भाग), 578(भाग).

9. मौजा - कालिकापुर, थाना संख्या - 3, थाना - मेजिया में अर्जित किये जाने वाले प्लॉट ।

1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 76/876, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 229/887, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 271/873, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438,

439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466, 466/882, 467, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490, 498, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 511/885, 511/886, 511/888, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657, 658, 659, 660, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669, 670, 671, 672, 673, 674, 675, 676, 677, 677/889, 678, 679, 680, 681, 682, 683, 684, 685, 686, 687, 688, 689, 690, 691, 692, 693, 694, 695, 696, 697, 698, 699, 700, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 705/879, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722, 723, 724, 725, 726, 727, 728, 729, 730, 731, 732, 733, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 744, 745, 746, 746/884, 746/883, 747, 748, 749, 750, 751, 752, 753, 754, 755, 756, 757, 758, 759, 760, 761, 762, 763, 764, 765, 766, 766/874, 766/875, 767, 768, 769, 770, 771, 772, 773, 774, 775, 776, 777, 778, 779, 780, 781, 782, 783, 784, 785, 786, 787, 788, 789, 790, 791, 792, 793, 794, 795, 796, 797, 798, 799, 800, 801, 802, 803, 804, 805, 806, 807, 808, 809, 810, 811, 811/888, 812, 813, 814, 815, 816, 817, 818, 819, 820, 821, 822, 823, 824, 825, 826, 827, 828, 829, 830, 831, 832, 833, 834, 835, 836, 837, 838, 839, 840, 840/881, 841, 842, 843, 844, 845, 846, 847, 848, 849, 850, 851, 852, 853, 854, 855, 856, 857, 858, 859, 860, 861, 862, 863, 864, 865, 866, 867, 867/877, 868, 869, 870, 871.

10. मौजा - कालिदासपुर, थाना संख्या - 2, थाना - मेजिया में अर्जित किये जाने वाले प्लॉट ।

1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17(भाग), 18(भाग), 19, 20(भाग), 24(भाग), 24/774, 25(भाग), 26(भाग), 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 46/777, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 58/776, 59, 59/775, 60, 61, 61/754, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 92/770, 92/771, 93, 94, 94/772, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 152/759, 153, 154, 154/760, 155, 155/761, 156, 156/762, 157, 157/756, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 193/763, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212,

213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 229/788, 230, 230/785, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 243/789, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 251/787, 252, 253, 253/780, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 258/764, 258/765, 259, 259/766, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 294/790, 295, 295/791, 296, 297, 298, 298/779, 298/786, 299, 299/767, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 323/757, 323/758, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 357/768, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406(भाग), 412(भाग), 413, 414, 415(भाग), 416, 417, 418, 419(भाग), 420, 421, 422, 423, 423/783, 423/784, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 428/778, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444(भाग), 445(भाग), 641(भाग), 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657, 658, 659, 660, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669, 670(भाग), 671(भाग), 672, 673(भाग), 674, 675(भाग), 676(भाग), 678(भाग), 679, 680(भाग), 682(भाग), 698(भाग), 699, 700, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722, 723, 724, 725, 726(भाग), 727, 728, 729, 730, 730/782, 731, 732, 733, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 744, 745, 746, 747, 748, 749, 750, 751, 752.

11. मौजा - जुगीबाग, थाना संख्या - 15, थाना - मेजिया में अर्जित किये जाने वाले प्लॉट ।

969(भाग), 970(भाग), 971, 972, 973, 974, 975(भाग), 978(भाग), 979, 980, 981, 982, 983, 984, 985, 986, 987, 988, 989, 990, 991, 992, 993, 994, 995, 996, 997, 998, 999, 1000, 1001, 1002, 1003, 1004, 1005, 1006, 1007, 1008, 1009, 1010, 1011, 1011/1342, 1012, 1013, 1014, 1015, 1016, 1017, 1018, 1019, 1020, 1021, 1022, 1022/1343, 1022/1344, 1022/1345, 1023, 1024, 1025, 1026, 1027, 1028, 1029, 1030, 1031, 1032, 1033, 1034, 1035, 1036, 1037, 1038, 1039, 1040, 1041, 1041/1346, 1042, 1043, 1044, 1045, 1046, 1047, 1048, 1049, 1050, 1051, 1052, 1053, 1054, 1055, 1056, 1057, 1058, 1059, 1060, 1061, 1062, 1063, 1064, 1065, 1066, 1067, 1068, 1069, 1070, 1071, 1072, 1073, 1074, 1075, 1076, 1077, 1078, 1079, 1080, 1081, 1082, 1083, 1084, 1085, 1086, 1087, 1088, 1089, 1090, 1091, 1092, 1093, 1094, 1095, 1096, 1097, 1098, 1099, 1100, 1101, 1102, 1103, 1104, 1105, 1106, 1107, 1108, 1009, 1110, 1110/1347, 1111, 1112(भाग), 1113(भाग), 1115(भाग), 1116, 1117, 1118, 1119, 1120, 1121, 1122, 1123, 1124, 1125, 1126, 1127, 1128, 1129, 1130, 1131, 1132, 1133, 1134, 1135, 1136, 1137, 1138, 1139, 1140, 1141, 1142, 1143, 1144, 1145, 1146, 1147, 1148, 1149, 1150, 1151, 1152, 1153, 1154, 1155, 1156, 1157, 1158, 1159, 1160, 1161, 1162, 1163, 1164, 1164/1348, 1165, 1166, 1167, 1168, 1169, 1170, 1171, 1172, 1173, 1174, 1175, 1176, 1177, 1178, 1179, 1180, 1181, 1182, 1182/1349,

1182/1350, 1183, 1184, 1185, 1186, 1187, 1188, 1189, 1190, 1191, 1192, 1193, 1194, 1195, 1196, 1197, 1198, 1199(भाग), 1200, 1201, 1202, 1203, 1204, 1205, 1206, 1207, 1208, 1209, 1210, 1211(भाग), 1219(भाग), 1300(भाग), 1301(भाग), 1302(भाग), 1303(भाग).

12. मौजा - साहेबडांगा, थाना संख्या - 45, थाना - मेजिया में अर्जित किये जाने वाले प्लॉट ।

210, 223(भाग), 224(भाग), 225(भाग), 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258(भाग), 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264(भाग), 265(भाग), 266, 270(भाग), 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291(भाग), 292(भाग), 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299(भाग), 301(भाग), 302, 303, 304, 305(भाग), 307(भाग), 308(भाग), 309(भाग), 310, 311, 312(भाग).

13. मौजा - घुसरा, थाना संख्या - 13, थाना - मेजिया में अर्जित किये जाने वाले प्लॉट ।

1(भाग), 17(भाग), 18(भाग), 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49(भाग), 50, 51, 52(भाग), 59(भाग), 60(भाग), 85(भाग), 89(भाग), 90(भाग), 91(भाग), 92(भाग), 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276(भाग), 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287(भाग), 289(भाग), 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438(भाग), 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464(भाग), 465(भाग), 466(भाग), 467, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472(भाग), 473, 474, 475(भाग), 481(भाग), 483(भाग), 484(भाग), 499(भाग), 535(भाग), 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545(भाग), 547(भाग), 549, 550(भाग), 551(भाग), 646(भाग), 647(भाग), 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657, 658, 659, 660, 661, 662, 663(भाग), 664(भाग), 685(भाग), 686, 687, 688, 689, 690, 691, 692, 693, 694, 695, 696(भाग), 697, 698, 699, 700(भाग), 701(भाग), 708(भाग), 709, 710(भाग), 711, 712, 713, 714(भाग), 715, 716, 717, 718, 719(भाग), 722(भाग), 723(भाग), 724, 725, 726, 727, 728, 729(भाग), 730(भाग), 734(भाग), 735(भाग).

### सीमा विवरण

ए - बी	रेखा 'ए' बिन्दु से शुरू होगी तथा गांव/मौजा - साहेवडांगा, थाना - संख्या 45 नम्बर से गुजरती और 'बी' बिन्दु पर मिलेगी ।
बि - सी	रेखा 'बी' बिन्दु से शुरू होगी तथा गांव/मौजा - भारा, थाना - संख्या 1 नम्बर से गुजरती और 'सी' बिन्दु पर मिलेगी ।
सी - डी	रेखा 'सी' बिन्दु से शुरू होगी तथा गांव/मौजा - कालीदासपुर, थाना - संख्या 2 नम्बर से गुजरती और 'डी' बिन्दु पर मिलेगी ।
डी - ई	रेखा 'डी' बिन्दु से शुरू होगी तथा गांव/मौजा - जुगीबाग, थाना - संख्या 15 नम्बर से गुजरती और 'ई' बिन्दु पर मिलेगी ।
ई - एफ	रेखा 'ई' बिन्दु से शुरू होगी तथा गांव/मौजा - जाटश्रीराम, थाना - संख्या 14 नम्बर से गुजरती और 'एफ' बिन्दु पर मिलेगी ।
एफ - जी	रेखा 'एफ' बिन्दु से शुरू होगी तथा गांव/मौजा - घुसरा, थाना - संख्या 13 नम्बर से गुजरती और 'जी' बिन्दु पर मिलेगी ।
जी - एच	रेखा 'जी' बिन्दु से शुरू होगी तथा गांव/मौजा - जौरसा, थाना - संख्या 18 नम्बर से गुजरती एवं गांव/मौजा - घुसरा थाना - संख्या 13 के 'एच' बिन्दु पर मिलेगी ।
एच - आई	रेखा 'एच' बिन्दु से शुरू होगी तथा गांव/मौजा - घुसरा, थाना - संख्या 13 नम्बर से गुजरती और 'आई' बिन्दु पर मिलेगी ।
आई - जे	रेखा 'आई' बिन्दु से शुरू होगी तथा गांव/मौजा - खिराईतोड़, थाना - संख्या 12 नम्बर से गुजरती और 'जे' बिन्दु पर मिलेगी ।
जे - के	रेखा 'जे' बिन्दु से शुरू होगी तथा गांव/मौजा - जोटश्रीराम, थाना - संख्या 14 नम्बर से गुजरती और 'के' बिन्दु पर मिलेगी ।
के - एल	रेखा 'के' बिन्दु से शुरू होगी तथा गांव/मौजा - भुलुई, थाना - संख्या 6 नम्बर से गुजरती और 'एल' बिन्दु पर मिलेगी ।
एल - एम	रेखा 'एल' बिन्दु से शुरू होगी तथा गांव/मौजा - अर्धाग्राम, थाना - संख्या 7 नम्बर से गुजरती और 'एम' बिन्दु पर मिलेगी ।



एम - ए रेखा 'एम' बिन्दु से शुरू होगी एवं गांव/मौजा - अर्धाग्राम, थाना - संख्या 7 नम्बर, गांव/मौजा - साहेवडांगा, थाना - संख्या 45 से गुजरेगी एवं शुरूआती बिन्दु 'ए' से मिलेगी ।

फा. सं. 43015/2/2000-पी.आर. आई. डब्ल्यू]  
संजय बहादुर, उप सचिव

New Delhi, the 11th July, 2002

**S. O. 2360.**— Whereas by the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Coal number S.O. 2723, dated the 30<sup>th</sup> November 2000, issued under sub-section (1) of section 4 of the Coal Bearing Areas (Acquisition and Development) Act, 1957, (20 of 1957) (hereinafter referred to as the said Act), and published in the Gazette of India, in Part II, Section 3, Sub-section (ii) dated 16<sup>th</sup> December 2000, the Central Government gave notice of its intention to prospect for coal in 934.20 hectares (approximately) of land in the locality specified in the Schedule annexed to that notification.

And whereas the Central Government is satisfied that coal is obtainable from the said land;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the power conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 7 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby gives notice of its intention to acquire the lands measuring 934.20 hectares (approximately) in all rights as described in the Schedule annexed hereto:

Note 1.- The plan bearing number ECL/KBA/LA/KDP/2001 Dated 31<sup>st</sup> March, 2001 of the area covered by this notification may be inspected in the office of the Collector, Bankura District, Bankura (West Bengal), Pin Code number 722 101, or in the office of the Coal Controller, 1, Council House Street, Calcutta -700 001, or in the office of the Director (Technical), Eastern Coalfields Limited, Sanctoria, Post Office - Dishergarh, Dist. Burdwan ( West Bengal Pin Code number 713333.

Note 2 .- Attention is hereby invited to the provisions of section 8 of said Act which provides as follows:-

## **8 Objections to acquisitions**

- (1) Any person interested in any land in respect of which a notification under section 7 has been issued may, within thirty days of the issue of the notification, object to the acquisition of the whole or any part of the land or any rights in or over such land.

Explanation - It shall not be an objection within the meaning of this section for any person to say that he himself desires to undertake mining operations in the land for the production of the coal and that such operation should not be undertaken by the Central Government or any other persons.

- (2) Every objection under sub-section (1) shall be made to the competent authority in writing, and the competent authority shall give the objector an opportunity of being heard either in person or by a legal practitioner and shall, after hearing all such objections and after making such further enquiry, if any, as he thinks necessary, either make a report in respect of the land which has been notified under sub-section (1) of section 7 or of rights in or over such land, or make different reports in respect of different parcels of such land or of rights in or over such land, to the Central Government, containing his recommendations on the objections together with the record of the proceedings held by him, for the decision of that Government.

- (3) For the purpose of this section, a person shall be deemed to be interested in land who would be entitled to claim an interest in compensation if the land or any rights in or over such land were enquired under this Act.

Note 3 .— The Coal Controller, 1, Council House Street, Kolkata – 700001 has been appointed by the Central Government as the competent authority under the Act vide notification number S.O. 2520 dated the 11<sup>th</sup> June, 1983.

### Schedule

#### Kalidaspur Block ( Raniganj Coalfields) Satgram Area District Bankura ( West Bengal)

Serial number	Name of mouza/ village	Jurisdiction list number	Police station	District	Area in hectares (approximately)	Remarks
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1.	Bhara	1	Mejhia	Bankura	176.58	Part
2.	Bhului	6	Mejhia	Bankura	69.00	Part
3.	Kshiraitore	12	Mejhia	Bankura	20.00	Part
4.	Jotsriram	14	Mejhia	Bankura	188.00	Part
5.	Banskuri	4	Mejhia	Bankura	29.27	Full
6.	Jorsa	18	Mejhia	Bankura	5.00	Part
7.	Benakanali	5	Mejhia	Bankura	45.57	Full
8.	Ardhagram	7	Mejhia	Bankura	40.00	Part
9.	Kalikapur	3	Mejhia	Bankura	128.78	Full
10.	Kalidaspur	2	Mejhia	Bankura	90.00	Part
11.	Jugibag	15	Mejhia	Bankura	82.00	Part
12.	Sahebdanga	45	Saltora	Bankura	20.00	Part
13.	Ghusra	13	Mejhia	Bankura	40.00	Part
				<b>Total :</b>	<b>934.20 hectares</b>	<b>(approximately)</b>

**Plots to be acquired in village Bhara Jurisdiction List Number I. P.S. Mejia**

2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 36/3051, 36/3079, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 84/2985, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 90/2986, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 99/1615, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137(P), 138(P), 139(P), 140(P), 141, 142, 143(P), 144(P), 213(P), 214(P), 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227(P), 230(P), 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 309/2992, 309/2993, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405(P), 408(P), 409, 410, 411(P), 412(P), 427(P), 428(P), 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 443/2996, 443/2997, 443/2998(P), 443/2999(P), 444, 445, 446, 447(P), 448(P), 449, 450(P), 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496, 497, 498, 498/3042, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 541/3000, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 555/1611, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 634/3003, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 652/1612, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657, 658, 659, 660, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669, 670, 671, 672, 673, 674, 675, 676, 677, 678, 679, 680, 681, 682, 683, 684, 685, 686, 687, 688, 689, 690, 690/3004, 691, 692, 693, 694, 695, 696, 697, 698, 699, 700, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 708/3005, 709, 710, 711, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722, 723, 724, 725, 726, 727, 728, 729, 730, 731, 732, 733, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 743/3008, 744, 745, 746, 747, 748, 749, 750, 751, 752, 753, 754, 755, 756, 757, 758, 759, 760, 761, 762, 763, 764, 765, 766, 767, 768, 769, 770, 771, 772, 773, 774, 775, 776, 777, 778, 779, 780, 781, 782, 783, 784, 785, 786, 787, 788, 789, 790, 791, 792, 793, 794, 795, 796, 797, 798, 799, 800, 801, 802, 803, 804, 805, 806, 807, 808, 809, 810, 811, 812, 813, 814, 815, 816, 817, 818, 819, 820, 821, 822, 823, 824, 825, 826, 827, 828, 829, 830, 831, 832, 833, 834, 835, 836, 837, 838, 839, 840, 841, 842, 843, 844, 845, 846, 847, 848, 849, 850, 851, 852, 853, 854, 855, 856, 857, 858, 859, 860, 861, 862, 863, 864, 865, 866, 867, 868, 869, 870, 871, 872, 873, 874, 875, 876, 877, 878,

879, 880, 881, 882, 883, 884, 885, 886, 887, 888, 889, 890, 891, 892, 893, 894, 895, 896, 897, 898, 899, 900, 901, 902, 903, 904, 905, 906, 907, 908, 909, 910, 911, 912, 913, 914, 915, 916, 917, 918, 919, 920, 921, 922, 923, 924, 924/3011, 924/3012, 925, 926, 927, 928, 929, 930, 931, 932, 933, 934, 935, 936, 937, 938, 939, 940, 941, 942, 943, 944, 945, 946, 947, 948, 949, 950, 951, 952, 953, 954, 955, 956, 957, 958, 959, 960, 961, 962, 963, 964, 965, 966, 967, 968, 969, 970, 971, 972, 973, 974, 975, 976, 977, 978, 979, 980, 981, 982, 983, 984, 984/3013, 985, 986, 987, 988, 989, 990, 991, 992, 993, 994, 995, 996, 997, 998, 999, 1000, 1001, 1002, 1003, 1004, 1005, 1006, 1007, 1008, 1009, 1010, 1011, 1012, 1013, 1014, 1015, 1016, 1017, 1018, 1019, 1020, 1021, 1022, 1023, 1024, 1025, 1026, 1027, 1028, 1029, 1030, 1031, 1032, 1033, 1034, 1035, 1036, 1036/1616, 1037, 1038, 1039, 1040, 1041, 1042, 1043, 1044, 1045, 1046, 1047, 1048, 1049, 1050, 1051, 1052, 1053, 1054, 1055, 1056, 1057, 1058, 1059, 1060, 1061, 1062, 1063, 1064, 1065, 1066, 1067, 1068, 1069, 1070, 1071, 1072, 1073, 1074, 1075, 1076, 1077, 1078, 1079, 1080, 1081, 1082, 1083, 1084, 1085, 1086, 1087, 1088, 1089, 1090, 1091, 1092, 1093, 1094, 1095, 1096, 1097, 1098, 1099, 1100, 1101, 1102, 1103, 1104, 1105, 1106, 1107, 1108, 1109, 1110, 1111, 1112, 1113, 1114, 1115, 1116, 1117, 1118, 1119, 1120, 1121, 1122, 1123, 1124, 1125, 1126, 1127, 1128, 1129, 1130, 1131, 1132, 1133, 1134, 1135, 1136, 1137, 1138, 1139, 1140, 1141, 1142, 1143, 1144, 1145, 1146, 1147, 1148, 1149, 1150, 1151, 1152, 1153, 1154, 1155, 1156, 1157, 1158, 1159, 1160, 1161, 1161/3014, 1162, 1163(P), 1164, 1165, 1166, 1167, 1168, 1169, 1170, 1171, 1172, 1173, 1174, 1175, 1176, 1177, 1178, 1179, 1180, 1181, 1182, 1183, 1184, 1185, 1186, 1187, 1188, 1189, 1190, 1191, 1192, 1193, 1194, 1195, 1196, 1197, 1198, 1199, 1200, 1201, 1202, 1203, 1204, 1205, 1206, 1207, 1208, 1209, 1210, 1211, 1212, 1213, 1214, 1215, 1216, 1217, 1218, 1219, 1220, 1221, 1222, 1223, 1224, 1225, 1226, 1227, 1228, 1229, 1230, 1231, 1232, 1233, 1234, 1235, 1236, 1237, 1238, 1239, 1240, 1241, 1242, 1243, 1244, 1245, 1246, 1247, 1248, 1249, 1250, 1251, 1252, 1253, 1254, 1255, 1256, 1257, 1258, 1259, 1260, 1261, 1262, 1263, 1264, 1265, 1266, 1267, 1268, 1269, 1270, 1271, 1272, 1273, 1274, 1275, 1275/3015, 1276, 1277, 1278, 1279, 1280, 1281, 1282, 1283, 1284, 1285, 1286, 1287, 1288, 1289, 1290, 1291, 1292, 1293, 1294, 1295, 1296, 1297, 1298, 1299, 1300, 1301, 1302, 1303, 1304, 1305, 1306, 1307, 1308, 1309, 1310, 1311, 1312, 1313, 1314, 1315, 1316, 1317, 1318, 1319, 1320, 1321, 1322, 1323, 1324, 1325, 1326, 1327, 1328, 1329, 1330, 1331, 1332, 1333, 1334, 1335, 1336, 1337, 1338, 1339, 1340, 1341, 1342, 1343, 1344, 1345, 1346, 1347, 1348, 1349, 1350, 1351, 1352, 1353, 1354, 1355, 1356, 1357, 1358, 1359, 1360, 1361, 1362, 1363, 1364, 1365, 1366, 1367, 1368, 1369, 1370, 1371, 1372, 1373, 1374, 1375, 1376, 1377, 1378, 1379, 1380, 1381, 1382, 1383, 1384, 1385, 1386, 1386/3016, 1387, 1388, 1389, 1390, 1391, 1392, 1393, 1394, 1395, 1396, 1397, 1398, 1399, 1400, 1401, 1402, 1403, 1404, 1405, 1406, 1407, 1408, 1409, 1410, 1411, 1412, 1413, 1414, 1415, 1416, 1417, 1418, 1419, 1420, 1421, 1422, 1423, 1424, 1425, 1426, 1427, 1428, 1429, 1430, 1431, 1432, 1433, 1434, 1435, 1436, 1437, 1438, 1439, 1440, 1441, 1442, 1443, 1444, 1445, 1446, 1447, 1448, 1449, 1450, 1451, 1452, 1453, 1454, 1455, 1456, 1457, 1458, 1459, 1460, 1461, 1462, 1463, 1464, 1465, 1466, 1467, 1468, 1469, 1470, 1471, 1472, 1473, 1474, 1475, 1476, 1477, 1478, 1479, 1480, 1481, 1482, 1483, 1484, 1485, 1486, 1487, 1488, 1489, 1490, 1491, 1492, 1493, 1494, 1495, 1496, 1497, 1498, 1499, 1500, 1501, 1502, 1503, 1504, 1505, 1506, 1507, 1508, 1509, 1510, 1511, 1512, 1513, 1514, 1515, 1516, 1517, 1518, 1519, 1520, 1521, 1522, 1523, 1524, 1525, 1526, 1527, 1528, 1529, 1530, 1531, 1532, 1533, 1534, 1535, 1536, 1537, 1538, 1539, 1540, 1541, 1542, 1543, 1544, 1545, 1546, 1547, 1548, 1549, 1550, 1551, 1552, 1553, 1554, 1555, 1556, 1557, 1558, 1559, 1560, 1561, 1562, 1563, 1564, 1564/3020, 1564/3021, 1565, 1566, 1567, 1568, 1569, 1570, 1571, 1572, 1573, 1574, 1575, 1576, 1577,

1578, 1579, 1580, 1581, 1582, 1583, 1584, 1585, 1586, 1587, 1588, 1589, 1590, 1591, 1592, 1593, 1594, 1595, 1596, 1597, 1598, 1599, 1600, 1601, 1602, 1603, 1604, 1605, 1606, 1607, 1608, 1609, 1610, 1610/3009, 1610/3010, 1617, 1618, 1619, 1620, 1621, 1622, 1623, 1624, 1625, 1626, 1627, 1628, 1628/3023, 1631, 1632, 1633, 1634, 1635, 1636, 1637, 1638, 1639, 1640, 1641, 1642, 1643, 1644, 1645, 1646, 1647, 1648, 1649, 1650, 1651, 1652, 1653, 1654, 1655, 1656, 1657, 1658, 1659, 1660, 1661, 1662, 1663, 1664, 1665, 1666, 1667, 1668, 1669, 1670, 1671, 1672, 1673, 1674, 1674/3024, 1675, 1676, 1677, 1678, 1679, 1680, 1681, 1682, 1683, 1684, 1685, 1686, 1687, 1688, 1689, 1690, 1691, 1692, 1693, 1694, 1695, 1696, 1697, 1698, 1699, 1700, 1701, 1702, 1703, 1704, 1705, 1706, 1707, 1708, 1709, 1710, 1711, 1712, 1713, 1714, 1715, 1716, 1717, 1718, 1719, 1720, 1721, 1722, 1723, 1724, 1725, 1726, 1727, 1728, 1729, 1730, 1731, 1732, 1733, 1734, 1735, 1736, 1737, 1738, 1739, 1740, 1741, 1742, 1743, 1744, 1745, 1746, 1747, 1748, 1749, 1750, 1751, 1752, 1753, 1754, 1755, 1756, 1757, 1758, 1759, 1760, 1761, 1762, 1763, 1764, 1765, 1766, 1767, 1768, 1769, 1770, 1771, 1772, 1773, 1774, 1775, 1776, 1777, 1778, 1779, 1780, 1781, 1782, 1783, 1784, 1785, 1786, 1787, 1788, 1789, 1790, 1791, 1792, 1793, 1794, 1795, 1796, 1797, 1798, 1799, 1800, 1801, 1802, 1803, 1804, 1805, 1806, 1807, 1808, 1809, 1810, 1811, 1812, 1813, 1815, 1816, 1817, 1817/3040, 1818, 1821, 1822, 1823, 1824, 1825, 1826, 1827, 1828, 1829, 1830, 1831, 1832, 1833, 1834, 1835, 1836, 1837, 1838, 1839, 1840, 1841, 1842, 1843, 1844, 1845, 1846, 1847, 1848, 1849, 1850, 1851, 1852, 1853, 1854, 1855, 1856, 1857, 1858, 1859, 1860, 1861, 1862, 1863, 1864, 1865, 1866, 1867, 1868, 1869, 1870, 1871, 1872, 1873, 1874, 1875, 1876, 1877, 1878, 1879, 1880, 1881, 1882, 1883, 1884, 1885, 1886, 1887, 1888, 1888/3025, 1889, 1890, 1891, 1892, 1893, 1894, 1895, 1896, 1897, 1898, 1899, 1900, 1901, 1902, 1903, 1904, 1905, 1906, 1907, 1908, 1909, 1910, 1911, 1912, 1913, 1914, 1915, 1916, 1917, 1918, 1919, 1920, 1921, 1922, 1923, 1924, 1925, 1926, 1927, 1928, 1929, 1930, 1930/3043, 1931, 1932, 1933, 1933/3044, 1934, 1934/3045, 1935, 1935/3046, 1936, 1937, 1937/3047, 1938, 1939, 1940, 1941, 1942, 1943, 1944, 1945, 1946, 1947, 1948, 1949, 1950, 1951, 1952, 1953, 1954, 1955, 1956, 1957, 1958, 1959, 1960, 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964, 1965, 1966, 1967, 1968, 1969, 1970, 1971, 1972, 1973, 1974, 1975, 1976, 1977, 1978, 1979, 1979/3026, 1979/3027, 1979/3028, 1979/3029, 1980, 1981, 1982, 1983, 1983/3048, 1984, 1985, 1986, 1987, 1988, 1989, 1990, 1991, 1992, 1993, 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2000/3076, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023, 2024, 2025, 2026, 2027, 2028, 2029, 2030, 2031, 2032, 2033, 2034, 2035, 2036, 2037, 2038, 2039, 2040, 2041, 2042, 2043, 2044, 2045, 2046, 2047, 2048, 2049, 2050, 2051, 2052, 2053, 2054, 2055, 2056, 2057, 2058, 2059, 2060, 2061, 2062, 2063, 2064, 2065, 2066, 2067, 2068, 2069, 2070, 2071, 2072, 2073, 2074, 2075, 2076, 2077, 2078, 2079, 2080, 2081, 2082, 2083, 2084, 2085, 2086, 2087, 2088, 2089, 2090, 2091, 2092, 2092/3070, 2093, 2094, 2095, 2096, 2097, 2098, 2099, 2100, 2101, 2102, 2103, 2104, 2105, 2106, 2107, 2108, 2109, 2110, 2111, 2112, 2113, 2114, 2115, 2116, 2117, 2118, 2119, 2120, 2121, 2122, 2123, 2124, 2125, 2126, 2127, 2128, 2129, 2130, 2131, 2132, 2133, 2134, 2135, 2136, 2137, 2138, 2139, 2140, 2141, 2142, 2143, 2144, 2145, 2146, 2147, 2148, 2149, 2150, 2151, 2152, 2153, 2154, 2155, 2156, 2157, 2158, 2159, 2160, 2161, 2162, 2163, 2164, 2165, 2166, 2167, 2168, 2169, 2170, 2171, 2172, 2173, 2174, 2175, 2176, 2177, 2178, 2179, 2180, 2181, 2182, 2183, 2184, 2185, 2186, 2187, 2188, 2189, 2190, 2191, 2192, 2193, 2194, 2195, 2196, 2197, 2198, 2199, 2200, 2201, 2202, 2203, 2204, 2205, 2206, 2207, 2208, 2209, 2210, 2211, 2212, 2213, 2214, 2215, 2216, 2217, 2218, 2219, 2220, 2221, 2222, 2223, 2224, 2225, 2226, 2227, 2228, 2229, 2230, 2231, 2232, 2233, 2234, 2235, 2235/3071, 2236, 2237, 2238,

2239, 2240, 2241, 2242, 2243, 2244, 2245, 2246, 2247, 2248, 2249, 2250, 2251, 2252, 2253, 2254, 2255, 2256, 2257, 2258, 2259, 2260, 2261, 2262, 2263, 2264, 2265, 2266, 2267, 2268, 2269, 2270, 2271, 2272, 2273, 2274, 2275, 2276, 2277, 2278, 2279, 2280, 2281, 2282, 2283, 2284, 2285, 2286, 2287, 2288, 2289, 2290, 2291, 2292, 2293, 2294, 2295, 2296, 2297, 2298, 2299, 2300, 2301, 2302, 2303, 2304, 2305, 2306, 2307, 2308, 2309, 2310, 2311, 2312, 2313, 2314, 2315, 2315/3034, 2316, 2317, 2318, 2319, 2320, 2321, 2322, 2323, 2324, 2325, 2326, 2327, 2328, 2329, 2330, 2331, 2332, 2333, 2334, 2335, 2336, 2337, 2338, 2339, 2340, 2341, 2342, 2343, 2344, 2345, 2346, 2347, 2348, 2349, 2350, 2351, 2352, 2353, 2354, 2355, 2356, 2357, 2358, 2359, 2360, 2361, 2362, 2363, 2364, 2365, 2366, 2367, 2368, 2369, 2370, 2371, 2372, 2373, 2374, 2375, 2376, 2377, 2378, 2379, 2380, 2381, 2382, 2383, 2384, 2385, 2386, 2387, 2388, 2389, 2390, 2391, 2392, 2393, 2394, 2395, 2396, 2397, 2398, 2398/3052, 2398/3053, 2398/3054, 2398/3055, 2398/3056, 2398/3057, 2398/3058, 2399, 2400, 2401, 2402, 2403, 2404, 2405, 2406, 2407, 2407/3059, 2408, 2409, 2410, 2411, 2412, 2413, 2414, 2415, 2416, 2416/3060, 2416/3061, 2416/3062, 2416/3063, 2417, 2418, 2419, 2420, 2421, 2422, 2423, 2424, 2425, 2426, 2427, 2428, 2429, 2430, 2431, 2432, 2433, 2434, 2435, 2436, 2437, 2438, 2439, 2440, 2441, 2442, 2443, 2444, 2445, 2446, 2447, 2448, 2449, 2450, 2451, 2452, 2453, 2454, 2455, 2456, 2457, 2458, 2459, 2460, 2461, 2462, 2463, 2464, 2465, 2466, 2467, 2468, 2469, 2470, 2471, 2472, 2473, 2474, 2475, 2476, 2477, 2478, 2479, 2480, 2481, 2482, 2483, 2484, 2485, 2486, 2487, 2488, 2489, 2490, 2491, 2492, 2493, 2494, 2495, 2496, 2497, 2498, 2499, 2500, 2501, 2502, 2503, 2504, 2505, 2506, 2507, 2508, 2509, 2510, 2511, 2512, 2513, 2514, 2515, 2516, 2517, 2518, 2519, 2520, 2521, 2522, 2523, 2524, 2525, 2526, 2527, 2528, 2529, 2530, 2530/2984, 2531, 2532, 2533, 2534, 2535, 2536, 2537, 2539, 2540, 2541, 2542, 2543, 2544, 2545, 2546, 2547, 2548, 2549, 2550, 2551, 2552, 2553, 2554, 2555, 2556, 2557, 2558, 2559, 2560, 2561, 2562, 2563, 2564, 2565, 2566, 2567, 2568, 2569, 2570, 2571, 2572, 2573, 2574, 2575, 2576, 2577, 2578, 2579, 2580, 2581, 2582, 2583, 2584, 2585, 2586, 2587, 2588, 2589, 2590, 2591, 2592, 2593, 2594, 2595, 2596, 2597, 2598, 2599, 2600, 2601, 2602, 2603, 2604, 2605, 2606, 2607, 2608, 2609, 2610, 2611, 2612, 2613, 2614, 2615, 2616, 2617, 2618, 2619, 2620, 2621, 2622, 2623, 2624(P), 2625, 2626, 2627, 2628, 2629, 2630, 2639(P), 2641(P), 2642, 2643, 2644, 2645, 2646, 2647, 2648, 2654(P), 2990(P).

**Plots to be acquired in village Bhului, Jurisdiction List Number 6, P.S. Mejhia**

1, 2, 3, 3/512, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 17/513, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 22/514, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 58/511, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 96/515, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 217/521, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285,

286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 440/516, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 445/517, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 455/518, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501(P), 502, 503, 504(P), 505(P), 506(P), 507(P).

**Plots to be acquired in village Kshiraitore, Jurisdiction List Number 12, P.S. Mejhia**

1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48(P), 48/2236, 59(P), 60(P), 61, 62, 63(P), 64(P), 215(P), 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 227/2245, 228, 229(P), 230(P), 255(P), 256(P), 259(P), 260(P), 262(P), 262/2237(P), 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278(P), 279(P), 280, 281, 282(P), 291(P), 292(P), 293(P), 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308(P), 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317(P), 318(P), 319(P), 320(P), 329(P), 330(P), 331(P).

**Plots to be acquired in village Jotsiram, Jurisdiction List Number 14, P.S. Mejhia**

1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 17/1214, 17/1215, 17/1216, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 99/1179, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 119/1178, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 207/1203, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 227/1217, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 288/1180, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299(P), 301(P), 303(P), 303/1182, 303/1183, 303/1184(P), 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315(P), 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 323/1227, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 332/1187, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 375/1221, 375/1218, 375/1219,

375/1220, 376, 376/1222, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 452/1229, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 477/1181, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 532/1204, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 554/1090, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 571/1188, 572, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 585/1189, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602, 603, 603/1190, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657, 658, 659, 660, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669, 670, 671, 672, 673, 674, 675, 676, 677, 678, 679, 680, 681, 682, 683, 684, 685, 686, 687, 688, 689, 690, 691, 692, 693, 694, 695, 696, 697, 698, 699, 700, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722, 723, 724, 725, 726, 727, 728, 729, 729/1191, 730, 731, 732, 733, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 738/1195, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 744, 745, 746, 747, 748, 749, 750, 751, 752, 753, 754, 755, 756, 757, 758, 759, 760, 761, 762, 763, 764, 765, 766, 767, 768, 769, 770, 770/1192, 771, 772, 773, 774, 775, 776, 777, 778, 779, 780, 781, 782, 783, 784, 785, 786, 786/1194, 787, 788, 788/1193, 789, 790, 791, 792, 793, 794, 795, 796, 797, 798, 799, 800, 801, 802, 803, 804, 805, 806, 807, 808, 808/1196, 809, 810, 811, 812, 813, 814, 815, 816, 817, 818, 819, 820, 821, 822, 822/1197, 823, 824, 825, 826, 827, 828, 829, 830, 831, 832, 833, 834, 835, 836, 837, 838, 839, 840, 841, 842, 843, 844, 845, 846, 847, 848, 849, 850, 850/1198, 851, 852, 853, 854, 855, 855/1175, 856, 857, 858, 859, 860, 861, 862, 863, 864, 865, 866, 867, 868, 869, 870, 871, 872, 873, 874, 875, 876, 877, 878, 879, 880, 881, 882, 883, 884, 885, 886, 887, 888, 889, 890, 891, 892, 893, 894, 895, 896, 897, 898, 899, 900, 901, 902, 903, 904, 905, 906, 907, 908, 909, 910, 911, 912, 913, 914, 915, 916, 917, 918, 919, 920, 921, 922, 923, 924, 925, 926, 927, 928, 929, 930, 931, 932, 933, 934, 935, 936, 937, 938, 939, 940, 941, 942, 943, 944, 945, 946, 947, 948, 949, 950, 951, 952, 953, 954, 955, 956, 957, 958(P), 959(P), 960, 961, 962, 963, 964, 965, 966, 967, 968, 969, 970(P), 975/1209, 994(P), 995(P), 996, 997(P), 998(P), 999(P), 1000, 1001, 1002, 1003, 1004, 1005, 1006, 1007, 1008, 1009, 1010, 1011, 1012, 1013, 1014, 1015, 1016, 1017, 1018, 1019, 1020, 1021, 1022, 1023, 1024, 1025, 1026, 1027, 1028, 1029, 1030, 1031, 1032, 1033, 1034, 1035, 1036, 1037, 1038, 1039, 1040, 1041, 1042, 1043, 1044, 1045, 1046, 1047, 1048, 1049, 1050, 1051, 1052, 1053.

**Plots to be acquired in village Jotsriram, Jurisdiction List Number 14, P.S. Mejhia**

1054, 1055, 1056, 1057, 1058, 1059, 1060, 1061, 1062, 1063, 1064, 1065, 1066, 1067, 1068, 1068/1199, 1068/1200, 1069, 1070, 1071, 1072, 1073, 1074, 1075, 1076, 1077, 1078, 1079, 1080, 1081, 1082, 1083, 1084, 1085, 1086, 1087, 1088, 1089, 1090, 1091, 1092, 1093, 1094, 1095, 1096, 1097, 1098, 1099, 1100, 1101(P), 1103, 1104, 1105, 1106(P), 1107, 1108, 1109, 1110, 1111, 1112, 1113, 1114(P), 1115(P), 1119(P), 1125(P), 1126(P), 1127(P), 1133, 1134(P), 1135(P), 1172(P).



**Plots to be acquired in village Banskuri, Jurisdiction List Number 4, P.S. Mejhia**

1, 1/118, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 8/119, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 24/1209, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 61/117, 62, 62/121, 62/122, 62/123, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 92/124, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 111/125, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116.

**Plots to be acquired in village Jorsa, Jurisdiction List Number 18, P.S. Mejhia**

537(P), 538, 539, 540(P), 541(P), 542, 543(P), 544(P), 546(P), 555(P), 556(P), 557(P), 558(P), 561(P).

**Plots to be acquired in village Benakanali, Jurisdiction List Number 5, P.S. Mejhia**

1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 109/149, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148.

**Plots to be acquired in village Ardhagram, Jurisdiction List Number 7, P.S. Mejhia**

379(P), 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 388, 389(P), 390(P), 391(P), 392(P), 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460(P), 461(P), 464(P), 465(P), 467(P), 468(P), 476(P), 477, 478, 479(P), 480(P), 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496, 497, 498, 499, 500, 500/1346, 500/1347, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 531/1326, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543(P), 544(P), 549(P), 550(P), 551, 552(P), 552/1327, 556(P), 557(P), 558(P), 559, 560, 561, 562(P), 563(P), 564(P), 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570(P), 575(P), 576(P), 577(P), 578(P).

**Plots to be acquired in village Kalikapur, Jurisdiction List Number 3, P.S. Mejhia**

1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 76/876, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154,

155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 229/887, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 271/873, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466, 466/882, 467, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490, 498, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 511/885, 511/886, 511/888, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657, 658, 659, 660, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669, 670, 671, 672, 673, 674, 675, 676, 677, 677/889, 678, 679, 680, 681, 682, 683, 684, 685, 686, 687, 688, 689, 690, 691, 692, 693, 694, 695, 696, 697, 698, 699, 700, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 705/879, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722, 723, 724, 725, 726, 727, 728, 729, 730, 731, 732, 733, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 744, 745, 746, 746/884, 746/883, 747, 748, 749, 750, 751, 752, 753, 754, 755, 756, 757, 758, 759, 760, 761, 762, 763, 764, 765, 766, 766/874, 766/875, 767, 768, 769, 770, 771, 772, 773, 774, 775, 776, 777, 778, 779, 780, 781, 782, 783, 784, 785, 786, 787, 788, 789, 790, 791, 792, 793, 794, 795, 796, 797, 798, 799, 800, 801, 802, 803, 804, 805, 806, 807, 808, 809, 810, 811, 811/888, 812, 813, 814, 815, 816, 817, 818, 819, 820, 821, 822, 823, 824, 825, 826, 827, 828, 829, 830, 831, 832, 833, 834, 835, 836, 837, 838, 839, 840, 840/881, 841, 842, 843, 844, 845, 846, 847, 848, 849, 850, 851, 852, 853, 854, 855, 856, 857, 858, 859, 860, 861, 862, 863, 864, 865, 866, 867, 867/877, 868, 869, 870, 871.

**Plots to be acquired in village Kalidaspur, Jurisdiction List Number 2, P.S. Mejhia**

1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17(P), 18(P), 19, 20(P), 24(P), 24/774, 25(P), 26(P), 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 46/777, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 58/776, 59, 59/775, 60, 61, 61/754, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67,

68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 92/770, 92/771, 93, 94, 94/772, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 152/759, 153, 154, 154/760, 155, 155/761, 156, 156/762, 157, 157/756, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 193/763, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 229/788, 230, 230/785, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 243/789, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 251/787, 252, 253, 253/780, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 258/764, 258/765, 259, 259/766, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 294/790, 295, 295/791, 296, 297, 298, 298/779, 298/786, 299, 299/767, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 323/757, 323/758, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 357/768, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406(P), 412(P), 413, 414, 415(P), 416, 417, 418, 419(P), 420, 421, 422, 423, 423/783, 423/784, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 428/778, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444(P), 445(P), 641(P), 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657, 658, 659, 660, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669, 670(P), 671(P), 672, 673(P), 674, 675(P), 676(P), 678(P), 679, 680(P), 682(P), 698(P), 699, 700, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722, 723, 724, 725, 726(P), 727, 728, 729, 730, 730/782, 731, 732, 733, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 744, 745, 746, 747, 748, 749, 750, 751, 752.

**Plots to be acquired in village Jugibag, Jurisdiction List Number 15, P.S. Mejhia**

969(P), 970(P), 971, 972, 973, 974(P), 975(P), 978(P), 979, 980, 981, 982, 983, 984, 985, 986, 987, 988, 989, 990, 991, 992, 993, 994, 995, 996, 997, 998, 999, 1000, 1001, 1002, 1003, 1004, 1005, 1006, 1007, 1008, 1009, 1010, 1011, 1011/1342, 1012, 1013, 1014, 1015, 1016, 1017, 1018, 1019, 1020, 1021, 1022, 1022/1343, 1022/1344, 1022/1345, 1023, 1024, 1025, 1026, 1027, 1028, 1029, 1030, 1031, 1032, 1033, 1034, 1035, 1036, 1037, 1038, 1039, 1040, 1041, 1041/1346, 1042, 1043, 1044, 1045, 1046, 1047, 1048, 1049, 1050, 1051, 1052, 1053, 1054, 1055, 1056, 1057, 1058, 1059, 1060, 1061, 1062, 1063, 1064, 1065, 1066, 1067, 1068, 1069, 1070, 1071, 1072, 1073, 1074, 1075, 1076, 1077, 1078, 1079, 1080, 1081, 1082, 1083, 1084, 1085, 1086, 1087, 1088, 1089, 1090, 1091, 1092, 1093, 1094, 1095, 1096, 1097, 1098, 1099, 1100, 1101, 1102, 1103, 1104, 1105, 1106, 1107, 1108, 1009, 1110, 1110/1347, 1111, 1112(P), 1113(P), 1115(P), 1116, 1117, 1118, 1119, 1120, 1121, 1122, 1123, 1124, 1125, 1126, 1127, 1128, 1129, 1130, 1131, 1132, 1133, 1134, 1135, 1136, 1137, 1138, 1139, 1140, 1141, 1142, 1143, 1144, 1145, 1146, 1147, 1148, 1149, 1150, 1151, 1152, 1153, 1154, 1155, 1156, 1157, 1158, 1159, 1160, 1161, 1162, 1163, 1164, 1164/1348, 1165, 1166, 1167, 1168, 1169, 1170, 1171, 1172, 1173, 1174, 1175, 1176, 1177, 1178, 1179, 1180, 1181, 1182, 1182/1349, 1182/1350, 1183, 1184, 1185, 1186, 1187, 1188, 1189, 1190, 1191, 1192, 1193, 1194, 1195, 1196, 1197, 1198, 1199(P), 1200, 1201, 1202, 1203, 1204, 1205, 1206, 1207, 1208, 1209, 1210, 1211(P), 1219(P), 1300(P), 1301(P), 1302(P), 1303(P).

**Plots to be acquired in village – Sahebdaṅga, Jurisdiction List Number 45, P.S. Mejhia**

210, 223(P), 224(P), 225(P), 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258(P), 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264(P), 265(P), 266, 270(P), 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291(P), 292(P), 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299(P), 301(P), 302, 303, 304, 305(P), 307(P), 308(P), 309(P), 310, 311, 312(P).

**Plots to be acquired in village – Ghusra, Jurisdiction List Number 13, P.S. Mejhia**

1(P), 17(P), 18(P), 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49(P), 50, 51, 52(P), 59(P), 60(P), 85(P), 89(P), 90(P), 91(P), 92(P), 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276(P), 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287(P), 289(P), 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438(P), 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464(P), 465(P), 466(P), 467, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472(P), 473, 474, 475(P), 481(P), 483(P), 484(P), 499(P), 535(P), 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545(P), 547(P), 549, 550(P), 551(P), 646(P), 647(P), 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657, 658, 659, 660, 661, 662, 663(P), 664(P), 685(P), 686, 687, 688, 689, 690, 691, 692, 693, 694, 695, 696(P), 697, 698, 699, 700(P), 701(P), 708(P), 709, 710(P), 711, 712, 713, 714(P), 715, 716, 717, 718, 719(P), 722(P), 723(P), 724, 725, 726, 727, 728, 729(P), 730(P), 734(P), 735(P).

**Bourndary Description :**

**A-B** Line start - from point A and passes through village/village Sahebdaṅga, Jurisdiction List Number 45 and meets at point B.

**B-C** Line start - from point B and passes through village/ village Bhara, Jurisdiction List Number & meets as point C.

- C-D** Line start - from point C and passes through village/ village Kalidaspur, Jurisdiction List Number 2 and meets at point D.
- D-E** Line start - from pont D and passes through village/ village Jugibag, Jurisdiction List Number 15 and meets at point E.
- E-F** Line start - from point E and passes through village/village Jotsriram , Jurisdiction List Number 14 and meets at point F.
- F-G** Line start - from point F and passes through village/village Ghusra , Jurisdiction List Number 13 and meets at point G.
- G-H** Line start - from point G and passes through village/village Jorsa , Jurisdiction List Number 18 and meets at point H in village/village Ghusra, Jurisdiction List Number 13.
- H-I** Line start - from point H and passess through village/village Ghusra, Jurisdiction List Number 13 and meets at point I.
- I-J** Line start - from point I and passes through village/village Kshiraitore Jurisdiction List Number 12 and meets at point J.
- J-K** Line start - from point J and passes again through village/village Jotsriram Jurisdiction List Number 14 and meets at point L.
- K-L** Line start - from point K and passes through village/village Bhului, Jurisdiction List Number 6 and meets at point L.
- L-M** Line start - from point L and passes through village/village Ardhagram, Jurisdiction List Number 7 and meets at point M.
- M-A** A Line start - from point M and passes through village/village Ardhagram, Jurisdiction List Number 7, village/village - Bhara, Jurisdiction List Number 1 and village/village Sahebdanga, Jurisdiction List Number 45 and meets at the starting point A.

**श्रम मंत्रालय**

नई दिल्ली, 18 जून, 2002

**का. आ. 2361.**—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार दानापुर केन्टोन्मेंट बोर्ड के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण नं०-1 धनबाद, के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 143/91) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 18-06-2002 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल. 13012/8/91-आई.आर. (डी.यू.)]

कुलदीप राय वर्मा, डेस्क अधिकारी

**MINISTRY OF LABOUR**

New Delhi, the 18th June, 2002

**S.O. 2361.**—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 143/91) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court No. I, Dhanbad now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Danapur Cantonment Board and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 18-06-2002.

[No. L-13012/8/91-IR (DU)]

KULDIP RAI VERMA, Desk Officer

**ANNEXURE****BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-No I, DHANBAD**

In the matter of a reference under Sec 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947

**Reference No. 143 of 1991.**

**Parties :** Employers in relation to the management of Danapur Cantonment Board.

**AND**

Their Workmen.

**Present :**

Shri S.H. Kazmi,  
Presiding Officer.

**Appearances :**

For the Employers	: Shri S.K. Agarwalla, Advocate.
For the Workman	: Shri D. Mukherjee, Advocate.
State	: Bihar.
Industry	: Cantonment.

Dated the 31st May, 2002

**AWARD**

By Order No.L-13012/8/91-I.R. (D.U.) dated the 19th November, 1991 the Central Government in the Ministry of Labour has, in exercise of powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), referred the following dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal:

"Whether the action of the Management of the Cantonment Board, Danapur in terminating the services of Sh. Ram Babu Sharma w.e.f. 1-8-85 is justified? If not, what relief he is entitled to?"

2. Precisely, the case of the concerned workman is that he was employed in the Cantonment in the year 1980 on the post of Safaiwala (Sanitary Jamadar) on daily wages and was in its service till 1-8-85 i.e. for a total period of more than 240 days in one calendar year though for the sake of meeting out formalities an intervention of a day or more was imposed, but as a matter of fact he remained all along in the service holding the same post of different capacity in the same Deptt. and that too on the initial appointment and on the break of service to meet out formalities, no other fresh appointment letter was issued by the establishment concerned and as such the continuity of service was never affected in true sense. It has been said that to the utter surprise of the concerned workman, all of a sudden, the then chief executive officer of Danapur cantonment terminated the service of the concerned workman w.e.f. 1-8-85 verbally without showing any rhyme or reason and without serving any notice, notice pay or granting retrenchment compensation. Further it has been said that the concerned workman represented before the higher authority on several occasions but they never made any response, it is also said that the concerned authority thereafter engaged four persons without taking into account the terminated employees including the concerned workman, with mala fide and vested interest and also in an illegal manner. There were other posts of Pcon and chowkidar also available but never any opportunity was given to the concerned workman for being engaged. As such, lastly it has been said that the termination of service of the concerned workman w.e.f. 1-8-85 is illegal, arbitrary and null and void and he should be reinstated in his service with back wages.

3. The management, on the other hand has come out with the case as disclosed in its written statement that the concerned workman alongwith few others was appointed on the terms and conditions that he may be terminated without being given any notice. Further its case is that the service of the concerned workman was terminated w.e.f. 1-8-85 as he was not found suitable as required by the procedure under Cantonment Fund Servant Rule, 1937 and his name was not sponsored by the employment exchange for appointment in Cantonment Board and further there was no vacant and sanctioned post

available in the cantonment board at the time of termination of service of the concerned workman and even presently the same is not available. It has also been said that the Concerned workman has not acquired the requisite qualification as per the conditions laid down under Rule 5 of the Cantonment Fund Servant Rules, 1937 for appointment in the Cantonment Board. Further it has been said that the persons whose services were regularised were suitable under the conditions laid down in C.F.S. Rules, 1937. It is said that as the concerned workman was not found eligible and suitable for permanent appointment his service was terminated. Lastly, it has been averred that the concerned workman does not deserve any relief as prayed for

4. In view of the stands taken by the respective sides it becomes obvious that the moot question which appears to be involved and which requires consideration is whether the concerned workman can be taken to have worked continuously from the year 1980 to 1985 or for a period of more than 240 days in one calendar year on the strength of any appointment letter issued initially and also whether his dis-engagement or alleged termination amounts to retrenchment or not for the grant of any relief as claimed.

5. As seen above the specific assertion from the side of the concerned workman is that he was appointed on daily wages basis in the year 1980 and continued to work in different capacity till the year 1985 in course of which he put in the attendance of more than 240 days in one calendar year, but even then further according to the assertion without giving any notice or observing formalities as required under the law his service was terminated on 1-8-85 and that too verbally. It has also been asserted that after his termination several other persons were engaged quite ignoring the case of the concerned workman for permanent appointment and despite several representations submitted by the concerned workman and availability of the vacant post, at no point of time any consideration was made with regard to reinstatement or permanent appointment of the concerned workman as Class-IV employee. In support of all these assertions the concerned workman has taken the help of few certificates granted by the superior authorities of the Cantonment Board in respect of his continuous period of work as also about his conduct and behaviour and those are marked Exts. W-1 and W-2. He also takes the help of two Office Orders dated 22-6-82 and 30-6-82 marked Exts. W-5 and W-5/1 respectively in order to show that the concerned workman along with others was described as a staff of Cantonment Board and was assigned particular duty to be performed. Ext. W-4 is the reply submitted by the management before the R.L.C. (C), Patna and Ext. W-6 is the signature of the concerned workman upon the petition filed by him before the R.L.C. (C), Patna, raising industrial dispute.

6. The management's stand, on the other hand, as it is obvious from the above, is that the concerned workman

though worked on daily wage basis between the year 1980 to 1985 but in the year 1985 his service was terminated as he was not found eligible and suitable. No denial has been made with respect to the fact that the service of the concerned workman was terminated verbally without any notice, notice pay, etc. In its rejoinder to the rejoinder filed by the workman to the written statement of the management further the plea has been taken that the concerned workman was not appointed upon observance of all the terms and conditions as prescribed under C.F.S. Rules, 1937 and he worked on daily wage basis with discontinued for one or two days in a month which is obvious from the letter issued to engaged him and hence the question of challenging the action of the management does not arise. It has also been asserted therein that it is correct that some new appointments were made on vacant post but by adopting all procedure and the concerned workman did not turn up for interview at that time. Further the averments made therein is that the concerned workman was engaged for a specific period and after expiry of the period his services stood discontinued. Therefore, as it is apparent, in the rejoinder instead of raising any other ground, the ground for discontinuation or dis-engagement taken is the expiry of specific period of engagement of the concerned workman who, according to it, was engaged from time to time with the intervention or gap of a day or two.

In support of all the aforesaid assertions apart from oral evidence, adduced the management has taken the help of different Office Orders, marked Exts. M-1 to M-1/14. Two other documents exhibited on its behalf is Ext. M-2 which is the signature of the concerned workman on Ext. M-1/2 and Ext. M-3 which is yet another Office Order regarding engagement of the concerned workman from 2-9-81 to 30-9-81.

7. The concerned workman in his evidence, as WW-1, has supported the stand taken by him and has said that since the year 1980 to 1985 he worked in the Cantonment Board which work was of permanent nature and he was appointed against permanent vacancy. According to him, he has already worked continuously for more than 240 days during the aforesaid period, but he was stopped from work w.e.f. 31-7-85 without any notice and without any payment of compensation.

Out of the two witnesses examined from the side of the management, MW-1, Kamalshwar Pathak, has stated that the concerned workman was engaged on daily wage basis but has shown his inability to speak about the total period of engagement of the concerned workman. However, he has said that the concerned workman used to be so engaged not on permanent post but for a certain period which period was mentioned in the different office orders some of which have been filed. MW-2, Udal Singh, has also stated about the engagement of the concerned workman on daily wage basis and about engagement

through office order. According to him, the concerned workman was stopped from doing work from time to time but again he was engaged and for every such engagement different office orders were issued. Quite apparently both the witnesses have not denied about the engagement of the concerned workman between the period 1980 to 1985 or for a period of more than 240 days. They both have placed much stress upon the fact that the concerned workman was engaged on daily wage basis for a certain period on the strength of different office orders. According to the management's case also though the concerned workman was working from 1980 to 1985 but with discontinuance of few days from time to time. As it has already been mentioned above the reliance for this has been placed heavily upon Exts. M-1 to M-1/14, the office orders. Having gone through those office orders the aforesaid contention of the management does not appear to be fully correct as Ext. M-1/8 to M-1/14 speak about continuous engagement of the concerned workman from 1-5-84 to 30-11-84 without any gap, break or interval whatsoever of even a single day. The total period of engagement of the concerned workman between the said period comes to about 214 days at a stretch. The office orders marked Ext. M-1/1 to M-1/7 are concerning the period between 10-10-83 to 29-2-84 and the same only show the gap or discontinuity for a day or two. The another two office orders marked Exts M-1 and M-3 are for the period between 3-7-85 to 31-7-85 and from 2-9-81 to 30-9-81 respectively. Interestingly, though the consistent case of the management is that the concerned workman was engaged from 1980 to 1985 but with discontinuity of a day or two or few days and through several office orders and though it is not its case that the office orders which have been filed are the only office orders through which the concerned workman was engaged, the management has not considered it necessary to produce the office orders between the period 30-11-84 to 3-7-85 and office orders of the period between 30-9-81 to 10-10-83 and further the office orders for the period between 1980 to 1-9-81 and also for the period between 29-2-84 to 1-5-84. It is reiterated that it is not the management's stand that during those period as regards which the office orders have not been filed, the concerned workman, in fact was never engaged or remained out of employment. Thus, in view of such circumstances it can easily be inferred that the management deliberately and purposely withheld those relevant piece of documents as in the event of production of the same the continuity of the period of engagement of the concerned workman would have become apparent. It has to be kept in mind that consistent case of the workman is that he worked continuously from 1980 to 1985 and one authority of the management, namely, cantonment Executive Officer has given the certificates marked Ext. W-1 and W-2 with respect to the continuous working of the concerned workman for four years or so, the authenticity of which has not been challenged and the same

were marked exhibits in course of the proceeding after waiving formal proof.

8. In the aforesaid context there is yet another pertinent aspect which cannot be over looked or ignored and that is to the effect that the concerned workman (WW-1) in course of his evidence has clearly stated that his as well as others attendance used to be marked and the vouchers through which payments were made once in a month, contain the number of days of their working in a month. According to him those vouchers as well as the Attendance Register, if produced, would show that he and others had worked every year for more than 240 days. In this context though as per management's witness (MW-2) he does not know if the attendance of the concerned workman was marked in attendance register but another management's witness (MW-1) upon question being asked appears to have clearly and categorically stated to that effect. According to him, it is a fact that the Attendance Register would show as to for how many days in a year Shri Sharma (concerned workman) had worked in the Board. Further, according to him, the payment vouchers should also reveal the same. He has then proceeded to make further statement that the Attendance Register and vouchers are in the possession of the Executive Officer of the Board. Significantly, in course of the proceeding those documents were called for at the instance of the workman, but the same were never produced and no explanation was furnished as to why the same were produced or cannot be produced. Quite apparently not only during his cross-examination, rather during his examination-in-chief itself this witness has clearly stated that Shri Sharma (concerned workman) was paid through vouchers and his attendance was also marked by the officer under whom he was placed. If such statements made by this witness are to be believed then the same fully corroborate the aforesaid statement of the concerned workman regarding marking of his attendance and payment through voucher. Those documents, as such, were certainly material piece of documents from which continuous engagement of the concerned workman could have been gathered. Due to non-production of the same by the management again reasonably the inference can be drawn that those documents were deliberately withheld as in the event of their production, the continuity of period of engagement of the concerned workman would have been revealed.

Therefore, in view of all the aforesaid consideration it can safely be concluded that during the period of his engagement between 1980 to 1985 the concerned workman had worked continuously as Sanitary Jamadar or conservancy Jamadar/Ward Jamadar and so in that view it was not justified on the part of the management to disengage him or terminate his service w.e.f 1-8-85 without any notice, notice pay or the payment of retrenchment compensation in compliance of Sec. 25-F of the I.D. Act, 1947 and since admittedly the management had not taken



any step in that direction, its action can only be taken to be illegal and unjustified

It has not been disputed that after the termination of service of the concerned workman four other persons were absorbed or were permanently taken into employment and as per the concerned workman his case was not considered at that time. In this regard statement has been made from the side of the management that the concerned workman at the time of recruitment never turned up for interview. Nothing has been placed to show that the concerned workman, in fact, was called for interview but failed to turn up. So far as the availability of vacancy is concerned in the reply filed before the R.L.C. (C) itself (Ext. W-4) it was accepted that few posts were lying vacant. Nothing has been brought to show that the vacancy which were earlier in existence are no more in existence or not a single vacancy is there for being filled up. Significantly, it has not been denied or disputed anywhere that the job which the concerned workman used to perform during the period of his engagement was the permanent nature of job.

One more aspect cannot go unnoticed and that is with respect to certain contradiction in the pleading and the evidence of the management. As it can be seen above, in the written statement the reason for the discontinuance or termination of the service of the concerned workman as disclosed is that he was not considered suitable for the post and secondly he was not having requisite qualification or was eligible for permanent employment under C.F.S. Rules, 1937 and his name was also not sponsored by the Employment Exchange. In the rejoinder filed on its behalf the reason was disclosed in this way that the concerned workman was engaged for a specific period and after expiry of that period his service stood discontinued. There is no mention about the eligibility or suitability. In the reply of the management before the R.L.C. (C), Patna (Ext. W-4) it stands mentioned that the service of the concerned workman was terminated on 1-8-1985 when there was no requirement and again there is no mention about eligibility or suitability. The two witnesses examined on behalf of the management have not made any statement about the eligibility or suitability taken as a ground of termination, rather they simply said about the engagement of the concerned workman from time to time for a specific period and they have not stated specifically as to what, in fact, was the reason of disengagement or termination of service of the concerned workman.

Besides the above, much has been stated from the side of the management about the lack of requisite qualification or the eligibility for appointment. But nothing has been produced in course of proceeding and nothing has come even during evidence as to in what way or why the concerned workman was found to be not suitable or was found to be not eligible for being appointed on the post on permanent basis. This apart, it is strange that the realisation of the suitability or eligibility of the concerned

workman for the said post was made by the authorities or the management only after taking the work from the concerned workman of the said post continuously for 4 or 5 years or for more than 240 days in one calendar year. Such attitude on the part of the management certainly comes within the ambit and purview of the term "unfair labour practice".

9. Thus, in view of all the aforesaid considerations and discussions made on the basis of materials on record, the concerned workman can well be taken to have worked for more than 240 days in one calendar year under the management and further can well be taken to have retrenched without compliance of the mandatory provision of law and consequently he deserves reinstatement on the post on which he was working at the time of his disengagement or termination, but of course without back wages considering the circumstances of this case as also in view of the fact that it has not been brought on record that in between the period right from the date of his disengagement or termination the concerned workman was sitting idle or was not engaged in any gainful service elsewhere.

10. The award is, thus, rendered as hereunder

The action of the management of Cantonment Board, Danapur, is terminating the service of the concerned workman, Ram Babu Sharma, w.e.f 1-8-1985 is not justified and consequently the concerned workman is entitled for reinstatement in the same post on which he was working at the time of his disengagement or termination, but of course without any back wages. The management, as such, is directed to reinstate him within 30 days from the date of publication of this award.

However, in the circumstances of the case, there would be no order as to cost.

S.H. KAZMI, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 19 जून, 2002

**का. आ. 2362.**—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार इण्डिया गवर्नमेन्ट मिन्ट के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, नई दिल्ली के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 200/99) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 19-06-2002 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-16011/2/99-आई.आर. (डी.यू.)]

कुलदीप राय वर्मा, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 19th June, 2002

**S.O. 2362.**—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref No. 200/99) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court New Delhi now as shown in the Annexure

in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of India Govt. Mint. and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 19-06-2002.

[No. L-16011/2/99-IR (DU)]

KULDIP RAI VERMA, Desk Officer

#### ANNEXURE

IN THE CENTRAL GOVT INDUSTRIAL  
TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, NEW DELHI

Presiding Officer : SHRI B.N. PANDEY

**In RE :**

**I. D. No. 200/99**

General Secretary,  
Noida Mint. Shramik Sangh Noida,

C/o Govt. of India Mint,  
D-2, Sector-1, P O No. 78,  
Noida (U.P.) ..... Workman

Versus

General Manager,  
India Govt. Mint,  
D-2, Sector-1,  
Distt. Gotambudhnagar,  
Noida (U.P.) 201301..... Management

#### AWARD

The Central Government in the Ministry of Labour vide its Order No. L-16011/2/99/IR (DU) dated 13-10-1999 has referred the following industrial dispute to this Tribunal for Adjudication :

“Whether the action of the Management of India Govt. Mint, Noida in relation to imposition of restrictions on medical facilities vide office order dated 29-5-98 is fair, legal and justified. If not, to what relief the workmen are entitled.”

2. On perusal of the file it transpires that despite various opportunities and notice, no claim statement has been filed so far. It appears that the Union/Labour/Workmen does not want to proceed with the case. Hence no dispute Award is given. Parties are left to bear their own costs.

11th June, 2002

BADRI NIWAS PANDEY, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 19 जून, 2002

**का. आ. 2363.**—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार ईस्टर्न नैवल कमांड के प्रबंधन के संयुक्त नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम

न्यायालय, विशाखापत्तनम् के पंचाट को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 19-6-2002 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-14025/3/2002-आई आर (डी यू)]

कुलदीप राय वर्मा, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 19th June, 2002

**S.O. 2363.**—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award of the Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court Vishakhapatnam as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Eastern Naval Command and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 19-6-2002.

[No. L-14025/3/2002-IR(DU)]

KULDIP RAI VERMA, Desk Officer

#### ANNEXURE

IN THE COURT OF INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL  
CUM-LABOUR-COURT : VISAKHAPATNAM

**PRESENT :**

Sri K. Veerapu Naidu, B.Sc., B.L., Chairman &  
Presiding Officer

Dated : 19th day of March, 2001

I.T.I.D. (C) No. 16/99

#### BETWEEN :

Karli Panduranga Rao,  
D. No. 7-328, Hanumanthavaka,  
Visakhapatnam-530 040. .... Workman

#### AND

- (1) Eastern Naval Command,  
Rep. Chief Staff Officer(P&A)  
Naval Base, Visakhapatnam.
- (2) Eastern Naval Command,  
Rep. by Commanding Officer,  
INS Circars, Naval Base,  
Visakhapatnam..... Management

This dispute coming on for final hearing before me in the presence of Sri B. V. Rao, authorised representative for workman and the Government Pleader, for management. Upon hearing the arguments of both sides and on perusing the entire material on record, the court passed the following :

#### AWARD

1. This is an application filed under Sec. 2A(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 r/w 12-A of the A.P.I.D. Rules.

2. The case of the petitioner is that he was appointed as Auto Driver in the 2nd respondent establishment which forms an integral part of the 1st respondent. He was

appointed in the month of February, 1991 but he was given appointment letter in the month of August, 1991 which was taken back by the authorities subsequently. He worked continuously without any break of service upto 25th October, 1996. He was abruptly removed from service without assigning any reasons. He used to enjoy benefits like weekly day off and statutory bonus. His duties are to carry Naval Officers from their Hostels to various duty areas and vice-versa, besides carrying material etc. belonging to the Naval Officers. Thus his duties are continuous and perennial in nature. The respondent employed several auto drivers like him both seniors and juniors and subsequently all of them absorbed into regular pay scales. One U. Appala Raju, an auto driver who is junior to the petitioner have also been regularised. In spite of repeated requests made by the petitioner, his services were not regularised. Hence this application

(3) The case of the management is that they used to engage the petitioner to drive an auto purchased out of the non public funds, from Feb., 1991 to Aug., 1996 purely on temporary basis also paid the honorarium out of the non public funds. However, in 1996 the requirement of auto ceased to exist and therefore, the said individual was informed about this and further engagement was discontinued. The auto was auctioned and was purchased by the petitioner who was one of the bidder and the petitioner was specifically engaged for Russian personnel who were here for specific commitment which was over in 1996. Hence the services of the petitioner were dismissed. It is false to allege that the petitioner was appointed as Auto Driver after due process of selection. The auto was procured from Non public funds for the purpose only and the driver was also engaged out of the non public funds and when the requirement ceased to exist during August, 1996, the petitioner was informed well in time of the fact. It is further pleaded that no driver was engaged out of non-public funds have ever been absorbed into regular cadre, as no such provision or rules exists. It is false to allege that many drivers both senior and juniors have been absorbed in regular pay scales and one U. Appala Raju has been appointed through Civil Employment Exchange by the competent authority through proper selection process. The specific requirement of the auto was over in the year 1996 and hence the petitioner driver was informed that the services are not required. The petitioner engaged on temporary basis and his services are being paid from non public funds account generated from by the sales of commodities to Russians. The profit accumulated will be utilised for maintenance. The officer-in-charge of non-Public Fund Account will be nominated by the Commanding officer, INS. Circulars for smooth running of account. The public fund organisation is not an industry within the meaning of Industrial Disputes Act and the petitioner is not a workman at all. The petitioner is neither reported from employment exchange nor appointed

against any vacancy, as such the petitioner can not claim even temporary restoration. Hence the petition is liable to be dismissed.

4. On behalf of the workman two witnesses are examined and Exs. W1 to W9 are marked. On behalf of the management MWs 1 to 3 are examined and Exs. M1 to M14 are marked.

5. Heard both sides.

6. The points that arise for consideration in this case are:

1. Whether the petitioner is entitled for reinstatement with back wages as prayed for ?
2. Whether the retrenchment of the petitioner is not in accordance with Sec. 25 F of the I.D. Act ?
3. To what relief the workman is entitled to ?

7. The undisputed facts in this case are that the petitioner was appointed as Auto Driver from non public fund in the month of Feb., 1991 in the Russians Hostel maintained by the respondents, while so, it is the case of the management that there used to be one Auto man for the Russians who used to stay in the Naval Hostel. However, the requirement of the auto ceased to exist, the petitioner was disengaged and the services were discontinued and later the auto was sold to the petitioner. The management also filed Ex. W1 dated : 18-9-96 by the staff officer stating that the auto bearing No. AP31-B 4093 is handed over to the petitioner. Ex. M2 is the certificate of sale of the auto to the petitioner for a sum of Rs. 20,000/-. Ex. M3 is no dues certificate issued to the petitioner. Ex. M4 is the receipt of a sum of Rs. 300/- salary for the month of September, 1996 for the final settlement of service. Ex. M5 is no objection certificate for the transfer of the auto in the name of the petitioner. Ex. M6 is the undertaking certificate given by the petitioner for the repairs etc. to the auto. Ex. M7 is the renewal of the temporary passes of the petitioner. Ex. M8 is the letter by the petitioner requesting for issuance of temporary card. Exs. M9 and M10 are the xerox copies of the renewals of temporary pass of the petitioner. Ex. M11 is the stamped receipt for a sum of Rs. 770/- towards the salary for the month of August, 1996. Ex. M12 is the page in cash book for Sept. 1996 showing the payment made on 26-9-96. Ex. M13 is the receipt for Rs. 850/- towards the salary for the month of July, 1996. Ex. M14 is the copy of the extract from the cash book showing the amount of Rs. 20,000/- towards the sale of auto and Rs. 300/- towards the final recovery of festival advance. Ex. W1 is the gate pass issued to the petitioner by Lt. Commander (SDS), Staff Officer (Soviet Estt.). Ex. W2 is the renewal of the gate pass. Ex. W3 is entry gate pass issued to the workman. Ex. W4 is another pass issued by the respondent to the

petitioner While in service, Ex W5 and W6 warning letters are given to the petitioner. Thus, the material and the evidence of these facts are not very much in dispute. The only thing is that because the services of the petitioner are not required and as such, he was disengaged in August, 1996 by the respondent. While so, it is the case of the workman that some of the juniors and seniors who are similarly placed with that of the petitioner are absorbed and the petitioner was not absorbed and his services were terminated without issuing any notice or paying any retrenchment compensation. Even though he served continuously for more than 5 years.

8. The learned counsel appearing for the management contends that the petitioner is not sponsored by the employment exchange nor he was appointed in any regular post and that there is no Auto Drivers post so as to continue the petitioner in service and the services of the petitioner are no longer required. The management examined MW1 an administrative officer-II, who deposed that the Eastern Naval Command is a Central Government Organisation, INS circular is under the control of Eastern Naval Command, Which do not have any control over the non-public funds and the officer who was in charge, will control over the non-public fund and the petitioner was not employed by the respondent at any point of time and there is an employment pattern to the employees of Eastern Naval Command as it is Central Government Organisation and no employee will be appointed without following the procedure as laid down. This witness admitted in the cross-examination that he cannot say that the petitioner was serving as an auto driver in INS circular as he came to Visakhapatnam on 31st July, 2000, prior to that he did not serve in the Eastern Naval Command. He also admitted that INS circular is a part and parcel of Eastern Naval Command. However, he admitted that INS circular will form an integral part of Eastern Naval Command. He also admitted that he does not know the workman personally. The officer incharge, Naval Hostel is examined as MW2 and he deposed that he was entrusted with the naval hostel for naval guest, senior officers and VVIPs who stays in the hostel and to ensure the collection of the payment of their stay in the hostel. He also deposed that there are 13 employees working in the hostel, they are all Government employees, they are having similarly situated and has been working in the hostel on part time basis as well as requirement basis. He further deposed that whenever they require the extra service they used to engage some part time employees. He admitted that the hostel premises belongs to the Government and it is being maintained by Military Engineering Service. He also admitted in his cross-examination that the hostel is not having any vehicle and Navy Hostel is under the Administrative control of the commanding officers of INS Circa prior to 1996 mostly Russians used to stay in their hostel and INS was also not providing sufficient transport

and as such some of them for personal transport of those Russians purchased one auto for transportation to market purpose, then one driver for that auto i.e., the petitioner was appointed by the Officer-in-charge of non-public fund. He also deposed that they have not given any appointment order and he got the information after verifying the non-public fund cash account. Thus, the evidence of this witness shows that the petitioner was appointed as an auto driver maintained by the hostel may be for the transportation of the Russians or other inmates in the hostel.

9. It is the case of the management that no appointment order was given to the petitioner, whereas the case of the workman is that he was given the appointment and the same is taken back by the authorities. Whatever it may be there is no written appointment order. In the absence of which, the version given by the workman that he was appointed as an auto driver is to be accepted and there is no contrary material to show that the petitioner was appointed only for a specific purpose and for a particular period. In the absence of which the appointment of this petitioner can not be said that it is a co-terminus with that of the requirement by the management nor for any specific period and it cannot also be accepted that the appointment of the petitioner was only on need basis as and when required.

10. Further, it is also admitted by MW3 a bearer in Naval Hostel that in the year 1996 the services of auto lifted prior to that some of the Russians used to stay in the hostel and further the hostel is running 2 autos and the petitioner worked as auto driver for 5 or 6 years and auto was sold to the petitioner, later the services of the petitioner was terminated. In the cross-examination he stated that his services were regularised. He also belongs to the petitioner union. The people who have worked in the year 1991 in the hostel were regularised and one U; Appala Raju and B. Raja Reddy are appointed as bus drivers and their services are regularised as per the orders of the Central Administrative Tribunal. The petitioners in ITID Nos. 16/99 and 21/99 and himself are being paid same pay by the officer of the Eastern Naval Command. He denied a suggestion put to him that because some other employees like petitioner have approached the Central Administrative Tribunal for regularisation of their services and hence the services of the petitioner were terminated.

11. Thus, here this a case where the petitioner worked continuously for a period of 6 years and odd as an auto driver in the Naval Hostel being maintained by the INS circular which forms as integral part of the Eastern Naval Command. It is also admitted by the Management that the services of the petitioner was disengaged as auto was sold to him and his services were no longer required. But in view of the evidence spoken to be MW3 that the hotel is running two autos and that some of the Drivers who are worked along with the petitioners were

regularised. Therefore, the termination of the services of the petitioner without issuing any notice nor paying any retrenchment compensation which certainly violates the provisions under Sec. 25F of the I.D. Act. Therefore, the termination of the petitioner is liable to be set aside. Even otherwise, the reason for discharging the services of the petitioner is only due to the absence of work or his services are no longer required but there is no material placed by the management that there is no work for the petitioner nor the service of the petitioner are no longer required when they are running two other autos. Even if the auto was sold to the petitioner the workman cannot be thrown out of the job without following the statutory requirement as provided under Sec. 25F of the I.D. Act, here in this case.

12. Thus, the termination of the petitioner is against the statutory provisions provided under Sec. 25F of the I.D. Act and also the principles of natural justice. Therefore, the removal of the petitioner is arbitrary and liable to be set aside.

13. Of course, there is a delay of about 3 years in this case in approaching this Tribunal after the termination of the workman but that by itself is not a ground to reject the relief for which the petitioner is entitled and at the most the relief can be granted by refusing or reducing the back wages and directing the payment of a part of back wages as laid down in the Supreme Court decision reported in AIR 1999 (SC) 1351 between Ajaib Singh Vs. The Sirhind Co-operative Marketing-cum-Processing Service Society Ltd. and another. The workman's representative also cited another decision for the same proposition reported in 2000(84) FLR 20 SC between Gurmail Singh Vs. Principal, Government College of Education and Ors. wherein it is held that the termination of service took place in the year 1981 and the dispute was raised in the year 1989. Their Lordships were pleased to hold that notwithstanding the delay, the dispute would still continue for adjudication, however he would be deprived of back wages for the period of delay.

14. The workman's representative also contends that the Indian Naval Hostel is also an industry and that the petitioner is a workman and the Tribunal is competent to adjudicate the industrial dispute between the workman and the respondent. In support of his contention he placed reliance on a decision of Bombay High Court reported in 1986(II) LLJ 154 between Indian Navy Sailor's Home Vs. Bombay Gymkhana Club Caterers and Allied Employees' Union and Another wherein it is held under Sec. 2(a) (1), 2(j), 10 of the I.D. Act, 1947 that the Indian Navy Sailors' Home is an industry within the meaning of S. 2(j) of the I.D. Act.

15. As rightly contended by the representative for the workman that the Indian Navy Hostel is being maintained by the INS Circular which is an integral part of

Eastern Naval Command is as much as it is an industry and the petitioner is a workman in the said industry. Therefore, in the light of my aforesaid discussion, I hold that the termination of the workman in this case is illegal and the same is liable to be set aside. Hence, both points 1 and 2 are accordingly answered in favour of the petitioner/workman and against the respondent/management.

16. **Point No. 3 :** In the result, the petition is allowed and an award is passed directing the respondents 1 and 2 to reinstate the workman forthwith with 50% of back wages and continuity of service. However, there is no order as to costs and each party is directed to bear its own costs.

(Dictated to steno, transcribed by her, given under my hand and seal of the court this the 19th day of March, 2001).

K. VEERAPU NAIDU, Presiding Officer

#### **Appendix of Evidence Witnesses Examined For**

Workman :	Management:
WW-1 K. Panduranga Rao	MW1 V. S. Tripathi
WW-2 Neelapu Kanaka Rao	MW2 Kolschandra Behra
	MW3 K. Venkata Sastry.

#### **Documents Marked for Workman:**

Ex. W1 Identity pass of workman.  
Ex. W2 15-5-92 Letter of management reg. renewal of tem. pass of workman.  
Ex. W3 Entry pass of workman.  
Ex. W4 Entry pass of workman.  
Ex. W5 30-7-91 Warning letter to workman reg. frequent absent to duty.  
Ex. W6 2-3-95 Warning letter to workman reg. absence from duty.  
Ex. W7 Xerox copy of form of driving licence.  
Ex. W8 Copy of judgment in DA No. 525/ 93 of Central Administrative Tribunal, Hyderabad branch.  
Ex. W9 13-10-95 copy of order in OA 1390/94 of CAT, Hyd.

#### **Documents Marked for Management:**

Ex. M1 18-9-96 letter to workman by management reg. handing over the auto documents.  
Ex. M2 24-9-96 certificate issued by management reg. sale of auto to workman.  
Ex. M3 No doc certificate issued by management to workman.

- Ex.M4 Receipt for Rs. 300 towards the salary for Sept., 1996.
- Ex.M5 17-9-96 No objection certificate issued by management Reg. transfer of the auto in the name of workman.
- Ex.M6 Certificate of undertaking given by workman reg. responsible for repairs of any defects.
- Ex.M7 17-8-92 Letter of management reg. renewal of the temporary pass.
- Ex.M8 25-4-91 Staff minute sheet reg. issue of temporary pass.
- Ex.M9 19-8-93 Letter of management Reg. renewal of temporary pass.
- Ex.M10 17-11-92 Letter of management Re. renewal of temporary pass.
- Ex.M11 Xerox copy of stamped receipt for Rs. 770 towards the salary of August, 1996.
- Ex.M12 Extract cash bill for the month of Sept., 1996 showing the payment of workman for the month of Sept., 1996.
- Ex.M13 Xerox copy of receipt of for Rs 850 towards the salary of July, 1996.
- Ex.M14 Extract of cash book showing the receipt amount of Rs. 20,000 from the petitioner towards the cost of auto (xerox copy).

नई दिल्ली, 20 जून, 2002

का.आ. 2364.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार दूर संचार विभाग के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय, कानपुर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 106/97) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 20-6-2002 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-40011/46/95-आई आर (डी यू)]

कुलदीप राय वर्मा, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th June, 2002

S.O. 2364.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award, (Ref. No. 106/97) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Kanpur now as shown in the annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Telecom Deptt. and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 20-6-2002

[No. L-40011/46/95-IR(DU)]

KULDIP RAI VERMA, Desk Officer

## ANNEXURE

BEFORE SRI R.P. PANDEY, PRESIDING OFFICER,  
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL  
TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR-COURT :  
SARVODAYA NAGAR, KANPUR

(Industrial Dispute No. 106 of 1997)

In the matter of Dispute between—

The State Secretary National Union Line Staff & Class IV  
U.P. Circle 204 P&T Colony.

Aliganj Lucknow. (For Arun Kumar Dixit concerned workman).

## AND

The Telecom Divisional Engineer,  
Sitapur

## AWARD

1. Central Government Ministry of Labour, vide its notification No. L-40011/46/95-IR (DU) dated 10th July, 1997 has referred the following dispute for adjudication to this tribunal—

“Whether the action of the management of Telecom Divisional Engineer, Sitapur in terminating the services of Sri Arun Kumar Dixit casual Lorry Driver is legal and justified? If not to what relief he is entitled for?”

2. The name of the workman was corrected vide notification of Government of India dated 10-2-1998.

3. The case of the workman as set up in the claim statement is that he was engaged as a driver by the Telecom Divisional Engineer Sitapur on 18-8-1993 and he continuously worked on that post till December, 1994. Thus he worked for more than 240 days during one year preceding the date of termination of his service and was thus entitled to get protection of Section, 25B and 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act. It has been alleged that no notice or notice pay or retrenchment compensation was paid to him at the time of termination of his Service. It has been alleged that the work of the driver continued in the department but his services were illegally terminated without any proper reason. It has been alleged that after termination of the service of the workman one Manoj was appointed on the post of driver, thus the management has violated the provisions of Section 25G and 25 H of the Industrial Disputes Act. It has also been alleged that it was necessary for the management to seek permission of the Government of India before terminating the services of the concerned workman. On the basis of these allegations it has been prayed that workman be reinstated in service with full back wages.

4. The case of the management as given in the written statement is that Arun Kumar Dixit was never employed in the Telecom Department at Sitapur; hence

there was no question of termination of his service. It has also been alleged that when he was not in the employment of Telecom Department at Sitapur there was no question of giving him any notice or notice pay and retrenchment compensation. It has also been alleged that workman is not entitled to be reinstated in service with full back wages. It has also been alleged that the claim filed by the workman is not maintainable and is liable to be rejected.

5 On behalf of the workman rejoinder has been filed in which it has been clearly mentioned that he was engaged under SDO(T), Sitapur as Lorry Driver against vehicle No. UGC 6204 on 18-8-1993 and he continued to work on that post till 31-12-1994, without any break. It has been alleged that if there was any gap in service that was on account of leave sanctioned by the competent authority. He alleged that when he requested that he should be given permanent employment the management terminated his services. He further alleged that he had completed more than 240 days in a calendar year preceding the date of termination of his service. He further alleged that certificate was given to him for the period he served the Telecom Department and the same has already been filed in this court. It has also been alleged that the management has violated the provisions of Sections 25F and 25H of the Industrial Disputes Act, hence termination of his service is illegal and he is entitled to get relief of reinstatement in service with full back wages

6. The workman examined himself as W W.1 and filed two documents marked Ext W 1 and W.2 The management examined Sri Jaimal Sub Divisional Engineer Telecom, Sitapur as M W 1 and did not file any document in support of its case

7. The authorised representative for the workman has argued that Arun Kumar Dixit the concerned workman continuously worked from 18- 8-1993 to 31-12-1994 as Lorry Driver under SDO (T) Sitapur before the date of his termination of service dated 1-1-1995 and had completed more than 240 days continuous service during last preceding one year before the termination of service, hence the concerned workman was entitled to get protection of section 25 F of the Industrial Disputes Act. After going through the materials on record, I find force in this contention. Arun Kumar Dixit the concerned workman stated on oath that he continuously worked from 18-8-1993 to 31-12-1994 as driver of the Lorry of Telecom Department at Sitapur and he was engaged by SDO (T) Sitapur for the same and his services were terminated with effect from 1-1-1995 without giving him any notice pay or retrenchment compensation, hence his termination from service with effect from 1-1-1995 was illegal. He further stated that after the termination of his service on Manoj Babu was engaged as driver thus the management has violated the mandatory provisions of I.D. Act. He clearly stated that he was getting salary regularly every month

for working as driver on the motor vehicle of Telecom Department, Sitapur. In cross examination he stated that in August 1993 he worked for 14 days only and in October 1993 he worked for 26 days only because he had fallen ill and had proceeded on leave for the remaining days of October. The workman has produced two certificates Ext.W.1 and W.2 issued by Accounts Officer of Telecom Department Sitapur which indicate that Arun Kumar Dixit worked as Lorry Driver under SDO (T), Sitapur continuously from 18th August 1993 up to 31-12-1994 and he was paid salary for the aforesaid period regularly. Sri Jaimal M W.1 the present SDO (T), Sitapur stated that Arun Kumar never worked as driver in Telecom Department at Sitapur. He further stated that he worked only as daily wager and salary was paid to him for working as daily wager. It is notable that V. K. Srivastava and S. M. L. Srivastava the then SDO(T) under whom the concerned workman had worked at Sitapur had not been examined by the management to prove that he was not employed as Lorry Driver in the Telecom Department, Sitapur. The testimony of Jaimal that the concerned workman was never engaged in telecom department stands falsified by the certificates Ext. W-1 and W-2 issued by the Accounts Officer of Telecom Department at Sitapur. The genuineness of these documents has not been disputed before me. On the other hand these documents fully support the case of the workman that he worked continuously from 18-8-1993 to 31-12-1994 as Lorry Driver in Telecom Department under SDO(T), Sitapur and he had completed more than 240 days within one year preceding the date of termination of his service with effect from 1-1-1995. I, therefore, hold that the concerned workman was entitled to get protection of provisions of section 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act.

8. According to the oral evidence of Sri Arun Kumar Dixit and as pleaded by him in his pleadings no notice pay or retrenchment compensation as required under section 25F of I.D. Act was paid to him hence termination of his services with effect from 1-1-1995 is void and illegal. The evidence of M.W.1 that the concerned workman was a daily wager hence there was no question of giving him notice is liable to be rejected because even a casual labourer or daily wager who has completed more than 240 days of continuous service within a period of one calendar year preceding the date of termination of his service shall be entitled to get protection of the provisions of section 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act.

9. The authorised representative for the management has argued that the certificates Ext. W 1 and W 2 filed and relied upon by the workman go to show that Sri Arun Kumar Dixit the concerned workman was a casual lorry driver hence he was not entitled to get protection of provisions of section 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act. As a matter of fact the concerned workman could not be said to be a casual lorry driver. He continuously worked

as driver from 18th August 1993 up to 31-12-1994. It is also admitted to the management that one Manoj Babu has been engaged in telecom department as driver after termination of the services of the concerned workman. This shows that there was a regular work of driver in telecom department at Sitapur in the year 1993-94 and the concerned workman Sri Arun Kumar Dixit was regularly working as lorry driver in telecom department hence he could not be said to be a casual lorry driver. Merely because the then accounts officer has mentioned the concerned workman in his certificate Ext W.1 and W.2 as casual lorry driver the concerned workman could not be held to be a casual lorry driver when the work of driver was of regular nature.

10. M.W. 1 stated in his cross-examination that the concerned workman was a daily wager driver under SDO(T) Sitapur. Whether the concerned workman was casual labour or daily wager if he had completed more than 240 days continuous service within one calendar year preceding the date of termination of his services he was entitled to get protection of Section 25F of Industrial Disputes Act.

11. In *Calcutta Telephones versus Rintu Bagchi* 2001, Lab IC 2220, the Calcutta High Court has held that even a casual labourer working for more than 240 days preceding one year from the date of termination of his service is discharged from service without complying with the provisions of Section 25F of I.D. Act is entitled to be reinstated in service with full back wages. In that case a decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court made in *State Bank of India versus Sundermony* 1976, Lab. IC 769 has been referred in which the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that even a casual worker would come within the meaning of retrenchment as defined under section 2(oo) of I.D. Act and such casual worker would be entitled to the benefit of Section 25F of the Act. The Calcutta High Court has also referred in the aforesaid case a decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court passed in the case of *MCD versus Praveen Kumar Jain* 1999 Lab IC 619 in which the Apex Court of our country has held that even a daily rated workman discharged from service was entitled to the benefit of Section 25F of the Act and the employer discharging the services of a daily rated workman without complying with the provisions of Section 25F of the Act was liable to reinstate such daily rated workman.

12. The law laid down by the Calcutta High Court in the case mentioned above fully applies to the facts of the present case also. I therefore, hold that Sri Arun Kumar Dixit is entitled to get protection of Section 25F of Industrial Disputes Act. As the management has failed to make compliance of Section 25F of Industrial Disputes Act at the time of termination of his service with effect from 1-1-95, the termination of service of the workman is illegal and he is entitled to be reinstated in service with full back wages and all consequential benefits.

13. In view of findings recorded above I hold that the action of the management of Telecom Divisional Engineer, Sitapur in terminating the services of Sri Arun Kumar Dixit with effect from 1-1-95 is illegal and unjustified.

14. I, therefore, further hold that the concerned workman Sri Arun Kumar Dixit is entitled to be reinstated in service with full back wages and all consequential benefits. The management is directed to reinstate the concerned workman in the service of the management and to pay him full back wages within a period of three months from the date of publication of this award in the official gazette.

15. The reference is answered accordingly.

18th June, 2002

R. P. PANDEY, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 20 जून, 2002

का. आ. 2365.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार डाक विभाग के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, चेन्नई के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 139/2001) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 20-6-2002 प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-40012/26/99-आई आर (डी यू)]

कुलदीप राय वर्मा, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th June, 2002

S.O. 2365.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 139/2001) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court Chennai now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Postal Deptt. and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 20-6-2002.

[No. L-40012/26/99-IR(DU)]

KULDIP RAI VERMA, Dcsk Officer

#### ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL  
TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, CHENNAI

Thursday, the 13th June, 2002

PRESENT :

K. KARTHIKEYAN, Presiding Officer

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE NO. 139/2001

(Tamil Nadu State Industrial Tribunal I.D.No. 138/99)

[In the matter of the dispute for adjudication under clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2(A) of Section 10



of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), between the Workman Sri K. Veerappan and the Management of Superintendent of Post Offices, Nagapattinam Division.]

**BETWEEN**

Sri K. Veerappan : I Party/Workman

**AND**

The Superintendent  
of Post Offices : II Party/ Management  
Nagapattinam Division

**APPEARANCE :**

For the Workman : Mrs. S. Jothivani and  
G V. Kasuri Advocates

For the Management : Mr. K. Sivajothi, Advocate

The Govt. of India, Ministry of Labour in exercise of powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2(A) of Section 10 of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), have referred the concerned dispute for adjudication vide Order No L-40012/26/99-IR (DU) dated 22-07-1999.

This reference has been made earlier to the Tamil Nadu State Industrial Tribunal, Chennai, where the same was taken on file as I.D. No. 138/99. When the matter was pending enquiry in that Tribunal, Government of India, Ministry of Labour was pleased to order transfer of this case also from the file of Tamil Nadu State Industrial Tribunal to this Tribunal for adjudication. On receipt of records from that Tamil Nadu State Industrial Tribunal, this case has been taken on file as I.D. No. 139/2001 and notices were sent to the counsel on record on either side, informing them about the transfer of this case to this Tribunal, with a direction to appear before this Tribunal on 01-02-2001 with their respective parties and to prosecute this case further. Accordingly, the learned counsel on either side along with their respective parties have appeared and prosecuted this case further.

When the matter came up before me for final hearing on 03-06-2002, upon perusing the Claim Statement, Counter Statement, the other material papers on record, the written arguments filed by the learned counsel on either side, and this matter having stood over till this date for consideration, this Tribunal has passed the following :—

**AWARD**

The Industrial Dispute referred to in the above order of reference by the Central Govt. for adjudication by this Tribunal is as follows :—

“Whether the action of the management of Department of Posts, Nagapattinam Division, Nagapattinam in removing from service of Shri K. Veerappan from the post of EDDA is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?”

2 The averments in the Claim Statement filed by the I Party/Workman Sri K. Veerappan (hereinafter refers to as Petitioner) are briefly as follows :—

The Petitioner was working as Extra Departmental Delivery Agent at Kankodutha vanitham EDSO. The Sub Divisional Inspector (Posts) Tiruvarur, took inspection of the office and alleged certain irregularities in the performance of the Petitioner in that office and placed him under put off w.c.f. 29-6-91. Preliminary investigation was conducted and statements were recorded from some of the villagers in the absence of the Petitioner. The Sub Divisional Inspector (Posts), Karaikkal issued a memo of charges dated 14-1-92 alleging three acts of misconducts against the Petitioner as Articles 1 to 3. The Petitioner denied the charges. An enquiry was conducted by the Enquiry Officer. He submitted his report on 29-1-94. On receipt of the enquiry report, the Petitioner submitted his explanations on 21-2-94. The Disciplinary Authority by a memo dated 29-3-94 imposed punishment on the Petitioner by removing him from the service. The Petitioner preferred an appeal before the II Party/the Superintendent of Post Offices, Nagapattinam Division, referred to as the Respondent herein, and the said appeal was dismissed by the Appellate Authority by his order dated 12-7-96 and the order passed by the Disciplinary Authority for removing the Petitioner from service was confirmed. Then the Petitioner preferred a Revision Petition before the Post Master General, Southern Region, Trichy. It was also rejected by the authority on 18-6-97 by confirming the orders passed by the Appellate Authority as well as the Disciplinary Authority. All the Disciplinary, Appellate and Revisional Authorities findings were perverse and illegal. The Enquiry Officer has not based his reliance on any material and unimpeachable evidence. Only on surmises, the Enquiry Officer has held that the charges as proved. Though the prosecution witnesses have given statements in favour of the Petitioner during the preliminary enquiry, the Enquiry Officer has violated the principles of natural justice by relying on earlier statements of the witnesses during preliminary enquiry. Though the list of documents in support of the charges was given to the Petitioner along with the charge memo, he was not given the copies of those documents. The Petitioner was not given a personal hearing by the Disciplinary Authority or by the Appellate Authority or by the Revisional Authority before their respective orders have been passed. It amounts to violation of principles of natural justice by all the three authorities. Comparing to the gravity of the charges, the quantum of punishment imposed is disproportionate. Hence, it is prayed that this Hon'ble Tribunal may be pleased to pass an Award directing the Respondent to reinstate the Petitioner as EDDA Kankodutha vanitham EDSO with all service and monetary benefits

3. The averments in the Counter Statement filed by the II Party/ The Superintendent of Post Offices, Nagapattinam Division (hereinafter refers to as Respondent) are briefly as follows :—

The Sub Divisional Inspector (Postal) Tiruvarur Sub Division ( now Assistant Superintendent of Post Offices, Tiruvarur Sub Division), who appointed the Petitioner is the appointing and Disciplinary Authority. In this case, Sub Divisional Inspector (Postal) Karaikal Sub Division was appointed as ad-hoc Disciplinary Authority and he imposed the penalty of removal from service to the Petitioner. The Respondent is only the Appellate Authority and he cannot function as Appointing/Disciplinary Authority to the Petitioner and hence, the petition cannot be entertained and required to be dismissed. The Petitioner, while working as Extra Departmental Sub Postmaster, Kankoduthavanitham, EDSO and Extra Departmental Delivery Agent during 1991, had committed acts of frauds as mentioned in the charge memo issued to him. By the Sub Divisional Inspector, Karaikal Sub Division dated 14-1-92, he was placed under put off duty w.c.f. 29-6-91 and disciplinary proceedings were taken under Rule 8 of P & T ED Agents (Conduct & Service) Rules, 1964. In the enquiry conducted by the Enquiry Officer, the Petitioner for defending the charge memo availed the services of Sri W.S. Ramachandran the then LSGSPM Kumbakonam Division as his defence assistant. Ten witnesses were examined for the management and 26 documents were exhibited for the management during the enquiry. After considering the materials and evidence placed before the Enquiry Officer, he submitted his report with a finding that the charges levelled against the delinquent, the Petitioner herein, have been proved. The adhoc Disciplinary Authority and Sub Divisional Inspector (Postal) Karaikal Sub Division, after giving the Petitioner reasonable opportunity and on accepting the findings of the Enquiry Officer, imposed the penalty of removal from service with immediate effect on the Petitioner by his memo dated 29.3.94. The appeal preferred by the Petitioner was rejected by the Appellate Authority on 12.7.96. The Revision petition filed by the Petitioner to the Post Master General, Trichy was also rejected on 18.6.97 confirming the orders of punishment imposed by the Disciplinary Authority. The penalty imposed to the Petitioner is commensurate to the gravity of the offence committed by him. The domestic enquiry was held as per Rule 8 in an extensive manner and the Petitioner was given every reasonable opportunity to defend himself. In the domestic enquiry, standard of proof required is preponderance of probability and not proof beyond reasonable doubt. Therefore, there is no need to refer the matter for finger print experts, since the departmental enquiry is not a criminal trial. The Petitioner was permitted to peruse the list of documents and take copies thereof. He was also furnished with copies of

statements/documents during the course of enquiry. So, the departmental enquiry is not vitiated. The Petitioner has committed suppression of the Savings Bank deposits and committed forgery by withdrawal of an amount from S.B. Account No.709773. He had not made payment of two Money Orders. Thus, the severity of the offence committed by the Petitioner touches his moral turpitude. Therefore, the penalty awarded to him is justified and is commensurate to the gravity of the offence committed by him. As the Petitioner is not covered by Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the redressal available to him is before the Central Administrative Tribunal, Chennai Bench. Hence, it is prayed that the claim of the Petitioner may be dismissed, as he cannot be reinstated in service without valid grounds and reasons.

4. When the matter was taken up for enquiry, no one has been examined on either side as a witness and no documentary evidence has been exhibited on either side. The Respondent has filed Xerox copy of the proceedings of the enquiry with his report giving findings along with the Xerox copies of documents and statements relied upon by the management before the Enquiry Officer. This has not been objected to by the counsel for the Petitioner, though copies of these documents along with its list were furnished to her as documents relied upon by the II Party/ Management for this proceedings also. The learned counsel for the II Party/Management alone has filed the written arguments. In spite of the case has been adjourned to various dates for the counsel for the I Party to advance arguments, no argument has been advanced. Hence, it was held as no argument for the counsel for the I Party and it was reserved for orders to be passed on merits.

5. The point for my consideration is—

“Whether the Action of the management of Department of posts, Nagapattinam Division, Nagapattinam in removing from service of Shri K. Veerappan from the post of EDDA is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?”

Point:—

It is admitted that the Petitioner was appointed as Extra Departmental Sub Post Master, Kankoduthavanitham EDSO and Extra Departmental Delivery Agent by the Sub Divisional Inspector (Posts) Tiruvarur sub Division, now Assistant Superintendent of Post Offices, Tiruvarur Sub Division. For the alleged misconduct of the Petitioner during 1991, a charge memo was issued to the Petitioner dated 14-01-92. To enquire into the charges, an enquiry was conducted by the Sub Divisional Inspector (P), Mayiladuthurai South Sub Division. The Petitioner as a delinquent employee took part in the enquiry assisted by his defence assistant Sri W.S. Ramachandran retired LSGSPM, Kumbakonam Division. The xerox copy of the entire enquiry proceedings have been filed by the II Party/Management along with

the report of the Enquiry Officer as documents relied upon by the Respondent/Management. There were not objected to by the I Party. In the report submitted by the Enquiry Officer after conducting the domestic enquiry, he gave a finding that all the three articles of charges are proved. Against the finding of the Enquiry Officer in his report, the delinquent employee on receipt of the enquiry Officer's report has submitted his written representation to the Disciplinary Authority. The disciplinary Authority, after analysing the Enquiry Officer's report, further evidence both oral and documentary along with the written representations of the Petitioner, had found that the Enquiry Officer has properly come to the conclusion that the charges framed against the Petitioner stand proved based on evidences and has passed an order stating that the Petitioner ED agent worked in a rural area for about nine years in the midst of innocent villagers had demolished the confidence of public by way of suppression of deposit in S.B. Account and non payment of M. Os and pull down the image of the department in the eyes of public and he deserves no leniency at all and his grave misconduct calls for extreme penalty and hence he imposed the penalty of removal from service with immediate effect. Against that order of dismissal passed by the Disciplinary Authority, the Petitioner has preferred an appeal to the Appellate Authority. The Appellate Authority, after applying his mind and analysing the entire domestic enquiry proceeding, had passed an order stating that he find no reason except to concur with the opinion of the adhoc Disciplinary Authority and he rejected the appeal as there is no merit in the same. After the dismissal of the appeal, the Petitioner has preferred a revision petition to the Post Master General Tiruchirappalli. The Post Master General rejected the revision petition by confirming the decision of the Disciplinary Authority and the Appellate Authority. All these things have been admitted by the Petitioner. From the perusal of the records filed on behalf of the II Party/Management, which are not disputed by the I Party/ Petitioner, it is seen that the disciplinary proceedings was conducted according to the laid down procedures and the statutory provisions of Rule 8 E.D. Agents (C & S) Rules, 1964 by giving reasonable opportunity to the Petitioner who is the delinquent employees to defend his case effectively. Based on the oral and documentary evidence placed before him, the Enquiry Officer has given his findings that all the three charges levelled against the petitioner have been proved after analysing the entire materials placed before him. From this, it is seen that the contention of the petitioner that the perverse finding has been given by the Enquiry Officer without any basis is incorrect and his further contention that the Disciplinary Authority, Appellate Authority and Revisional Authority had violated the principles of natural justice in relying upon the perverse findings of the Enquiry Officer also incorrect. It is wrong to contend by the Petitioner that prosecution witnesses have deposed

in his favour and the Enquiry Officer ought to have held that the charges were not proved, since it is seen from the perusal of the records in this case that overwhelming evidence both oral and documentary available in this case for the Enquiry Officer to hold that all the three charges levelled against the Petitioner have been proved in the enquiry. So, it cannot be said that the Enquiry Officer has not based his reliance on any material evidence, but has given his findings on surmises and it is in violation of principles of natural justice and without application of mind.

6. The Perusal of the entire materials available in this case clearly establish that the proved misconduct of the Petitioner as E.D. Agent worked in a rural area in the midst of innocent villagers had demolished the confidence of the public and pull down the image of the department in the eyes of the public, as observed by the Disciplinary Authority in his order. He had come to a correct conclusion by stating that the Petitioner deserves no leniency at all and the misconduct committed by him is so grave in nature, which calls for extreme penalty. That cannot be said to be an improper decision arrived at by the Disciplinary Authority without any application of his mind, as he has stated in his order, the Petitioner while working as E.D. Agent in the rural area by committing the misconduct of suppression of desposit in the S. B. Account and non-payment of M. Os to the concerned is a grave misconduct which has to be dealt with severely. Under such circumstances, it cannot be said that the gravity of charge is not commensurate to the quantum of punishment imposed on the Petitioner by the Disciplinary Authority for the proved misconduct and it is disproportionate. So, the punishment imposed by the Disciplinary Authority for the proved misconduct of the Petitioner while in service by removing him from service cannot be considered as a severe punishment and is in violation of principles of natural justice. Hence, the Petitioner is not entitled to any relief, as the action taken by the management of Department of Posts, Nagapattinam Division, in removing him from service from the post of EDDA is legal and justified. Thus, the point is answered accordingly.

7. In the result, an Award is passed holding that the I Party/ Workman Sri K. Vccrappan is not entitled to any relief. No. Cost.

(Dictated to the Stenographer, transcribed and typed by him, corrected and pronounced by me in the open court on this day the 13th June, 2002)

K. KARTHIKEYAN, Presiding Officer

Witnesses Examined :—

On either side : None

Exhibits marked on either side : Nil

नई दिल्ली, 20 जून, 2002

**का. आ. 2366.**—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार डाक विभाग के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय चेन्नई के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 545/2001) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 20-6-2002 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-40012/32/98-आई.आर. (सी.यू.)]

कुलदीप राय वर्मा, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th June, 2002

**S.O. 2366.**—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 545/2001) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court Chennai now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Postal Deptt. and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 20-6-2002.

[No. L-40012/32/98-IR (DU)]

KULDIP RAI VERMA, Desk Officer

#### ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVT INDUSTRIAL  
TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, CHENNAI

Thrusday, the 13th June, 2002

Present: K. KARTHIKEYAN, Presiding Officer

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 545/2001

(Tamil Nadu State Industrial Tribunal I.D. No. 151/98)

(In the matter of the dispute for adjudication under clause (d) of Sub-section (1) and Sub-section (2A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), between the Workman Smt. R. Dhanalakshmi and the Management of Superintendent of Post Offices, Nagapattinam Division.)

#### BETWEEN

Smt. R. Dhanalakshmi : I Party/Workman

#### AND

The Superintendent of : II Party/Management  
Post Offices Nagapattinam  
Division

#### APPEAR ANCE :

For the Workman : Mrs. S. Jothivani and  
G. V. Kasturi,  
Advocates

For the Management : Mr. K. Rajendran  
Advocate

The Govt. of India, Ministry of Labour in exercise of powers conferred by clause (d) of Sub-section (1) and Sub-section (2A) of Section 10 of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), have referred the concerned Dispute for adjudication vide Order No. L-40012/32/98/TR(DU) dated 30-10-1998/13-11-1998.

This reference has been made earlier to the Tamil Nadu State Industrial Tribunal, Chennai, where the same was taken on file as I.D. No. 151/98. When the matter was pending enquiry in that Tribunal, Government of India, Ministry of Labour was pleased to order transfer of this case also from the file of Tamil Nadu State Industrial Tribunal to this Tribunal for adjudication. On receipt of records from that Tamil Nadu State Industrial Tribunal, this case has been taken on file as I.D. No. 545/2001 and notices were sent to the counsel on record on either side, informing them about the transfer of this case to this Tribunal, with a direction to appear before this Tribunal on 12-03-2001. With their respective parties and to prosecute this case further. Accordingly, the learned counsel on either side along with their respective parties have appeared and prosecuted this case further, who have already filed Claim Statement and Counter Statement respectively before the Tamil Nadu State Industrial Tribunal.

When the matter came up before me for final hearing on 28-05-2002, upon perusing the Claim Statement, Counter Statement, the other material papers on record, after hearing the arguments advanced by the learned counsel on either side, and this matter having stood over till this date for consideration, this Tribunal has passed the following: -

#### AWARD

The Industrial Dispute referred to in the above order of reference by the Central Govt. for adjudication by this Tribunal is as follows :-

“Whether the action of the management of Senior Superintendent of Post Offices, Nagapattinam Division, in terminating the services of Smt. R. Dhanalakshmi, Part-time sweeper is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?”

2. The averments in the Claim Statement filed by the I Party/Workman Smt. R. Dhanalakshmi (hereinafter refers to as Petitioner) are briefly as follows: -

The Petitioner was appointed as contingent sweeper at Nannilam Sub Post Office on 19-7-94 by the Sub Post Master, Nannilam SO and she was working there as such. While so, the Sub Post Master, Nannilam SO orally intimated the Petitioner that her services were terminated w.e.f. 1-8-97. The Petitioner approached the superior officials regarding her termination of service. On intervention of the superiors, the Superintendent of Post Offices, Nagapattinam Division allowed the Petitioner to work as contingent sweeper/water carrier. Subsequently, the Sub

Post Master, Nannilam SO restrained the Petitioner from attending her duties with effect from 6-12-97 without issue of any order or notice or notice pay. The then Sub Post Master Sri Kandasamy, Nannilam SO misbehaved with the Petitioner and the Petitioner also preferred complaint against the said officer before the Superintendent of Post Offices, Nagapattinam Division and an enquiry was conducted. The act of terminating the services of the Petitioner from the post of contingent sweeper/water carrier without issuance of any order or notice or notice pay is in violation of Section 25F of Industrial Disputes Act and is an unfair labour practice, where the Petitioner was subjected to sexual harassment. If at all the services of the Petitioner has to be terminated for unsatisfactory service, the II Party/Management ought to have issued warning or memo or show cause calling for explanation of the Petitioner. If at all the Petitioner's services were to be terminated for any misconduct, the II Party ought to have conducted an enquiry and afforded an opportunity to the Petitioner to prove her case and failure of the same will amount to violation of the provisions of Indian Constitution and of the principles of natural justice. In view of the continuous services rendered by the Petitioner for more than three years from 19-7-97 to 6-12-97, the Petitioner is entitled for the protection under Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and the Constitution of India. As such the Petitioner is entitled for reinstatement in service with attendant service and monetary benefits. Hence, this Hon'ble Tribunal may be pleased to direct the II Party/Management to reinstate the Petitioner in service with all service and monetary benefits.

3. The averments in the Counter Statement filed by the II Party/the Superintendent of Post Offices, Nagapattinam Division (hereinafter refers to as Respondent) are briefly as follows: -

The Petitioner was engaged to act as part-time contingent sweeper Nannilam sub Post Office temporarily w.e.f. 5-7-94, due to the absence of one Smt. Marimuthammal, former sweeper of that post office. To initiate action to engage the part-time contingent sweeper, the Sub Post Master, Nannilam addressed the Employment Exchange on 25-6-97. As no list was received from the District Employment Exchange till 2-8-97, he issued local notification on 2-8-97. In response to the local notification, four applications were received, amongst the four applications one Sri K. Sowrirajan was selected and placed as Sweeper, Nannilam Sub Post Office w.e.f. 6-12-97, terminating the services of the Petitioner. Aggrieved by this, the Petitioner has filed this petition. The Sub Post Master, Nannilam Sub Post Office is the competent authority to engage part-time contingent staff (Casual Labourers) for the purpose of sweeping and water carrying for this office. The Superintendent of Post Offices, Nagapattinam, the Respondent herein, is only the controlling authority for the Sub Post Master, Nannilam. The Petitioner has failed to mention the correct person as

the Respondent in this case. Enquiries made into the complaint revealed that the services rendered by the part-time sweeper, the Petitioner herein, was not satisfactory. The contingent sweeper post is not borne on the regular establishment and there is no statutory rulings to govern their services and as such there is no need for issue of termination notice. The allegation made by the Petitioner in her Claim Statement against the Sub Post Master, Nannilam are not true. The Sub Post Master has put in 36 years of service in the department and has got a satisfactory record of service. The enquiries made on this issue through their Sub Divisional Inspector (P), Karaikal revealed that the concerned Sub Post Master is a man of good habits and discipline. The Petitioner has added such allegations just to sustain her claim and to earn sympathy. The Petitioner's services were terminated on the basis of the unsatisfactory service. As per the judgement of the Supreme Court, the provisions of Section 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 cannot be invoked against termination of services of part-time contingent employees. Therefore, the claim of the Petitioner is not justified and acceptable. In the circumstances, it is prayed that this Hon'ble Tribunal may be pleased to dismiss the claim of the Petitioner, as vexatious, unsustainable and totally devoid of merits.

4. When the matter was taken up for enquiry, the Petitioner has not chosen to let in any oral or documentary evidence. Though documents have been filed on either side, they were not exhibited as their respective documents in this case. The learned counsel for the Petitioner has made an endorsement that she has consented for marking the documents filed as a xerox copy dated 26-7-97 by Respondent. The learned counsel on either side have advanced their respective arguments

5. The point for my consideration is—

“Whether the action of the management of Senior Superintendent of Post Offices, Nagapattinam Division, in terminating the services of Smt. R.Dhanalakshmi, Part-time sweeper is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?”

Point:—

It is the contention of the Petitioner that she was appointed as contingent sweeper at Nannilam Post Office on 19-7-94, till she was restrained from attending her duties w.e.f. 6-12-97 and that in view of her continuous services for more than three years from 19-7-94 to 6-12-97, she is entitled for protection under Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for reinstatement in service with attendant service and monetary benefits and that the act of terminating her services by the Respondent from the post of contingent sweeper/water carrier without issuance of any order or notice or notice pay is in violation of Section 25F of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, and it is an unfair labour practice. The learned counsel for the Petitioner would argue

that the Petitioner was engaged as part time contingent sweeper, while she was having educational qualification to hold the post, as studied upto V Standard and since the regular incumbent of the post one Mariammal has abandoned that post, she was employed as a part time contingent sweeper. In proof of this contention of the Petitioner that she was appointed as contingent sweeper on 19-7-94, no document has been filed. The Respondent in their Counter Statement has stated that the Petitioner was engaged to act as part time contingent sweeper, Nannilam Post Office, temporarily w.e.f. 5-7-94, due to the absence of one Smt. Marimuthu Ammal, former sweeper of this post-office. Further, it is alleged in the Counter Statement that subsequent to the regular selection made for that post. One Sri K. Sowrirajan was appointed as contingent sweeper w.e.f. 6-12-97 by terminating the services of the Petitioner. This has not been disputed by the Petitioner. Admittedly, the Petitioner has not been appointed by the competent authority as a part time contingent sweeper/water carrier for the sub post office, Nannilam. It is also not denied by the Petitioner that she was engaged to act as part time contingent sweeper temporarily due to the absence of Smt. Marimuthu Ammal, former sweeper of this post office. From the available materials, it is seen that the Petitioner was engaged as a part-time contingent sweeper temporarily in the place of the regular incumbent for that office in that post. Except mere pleading in the Claim Statement, no document worth considered has been filed by the Petitioner in support of her contention that she has been appointed as contingent sweeper and that she has been terminated from service w.e.f. 6-12-97 without any rhyme or reason. The admitted fact in this case is that the Petitioner has been engaged as a contingent part-time sweeper, who has not been appointed as per the service rules in the department for the permanent post. There was no appointment order as well as the order of termination of service issued to the Petitioner by the competent appointing authority. So under such circumstances, there is no question of the Respondent/Department violating the provision of Section 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 in disengaging the Petitioner from service w.e.f. 6-12-97, as the Petitioner was engaged to act as part time contingent sweeper temporarily in the vacancy caused in a permanent post, due to the absence of the regular incumbent, she cannot claim it as a right to hold that post and hence she is not entitled to any prior notice or notice pay as required under section 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. Under such circumstances, it cannot be said that it is the unfair labour practice or in violation of the principles of natural justice. A mere continuance of service for quite some time, as temporary part time contingent sweeper will not by itself confer the Petitioner any right or entitlement to the permanent post. Further, it is not the case of the Petitioner that Senior Superintendent of Post Offices, Nagapattinam Division had terminated her service as part-time sweeper. It is not pleaded

so in the Claim Statement itself. Under such circumstances, the question of alleged action of termination of services of Smt. R. Dhanalakshmi by the Respondent/Senior Superintendent of Post Offices, Nagapattinam Division does not at all arise to adjudicate whether such action is legal or otherwise and hence, the Petitioner, concerned workman is not entitled to any relief. Thus, the point is answered accordingly.

6. In the result, an Award is passed holding that the I Party/Workman Smt. R. Dhanalakshmi is not entitled for any relief. No Cost.

(Dictated to the Stenographer, transcribed and typed by him, corrected and pronounced by me in the open court on this day the 13th June, 2002.)

K. KARTHIKEYAN Presiding Officer

Witnesses Examined :—

On either side : None

Exhibits marked on either side : Nil

नई दिल्ली, 20 जून, 2002

का. आ. 2367.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार डाक विभाग के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण चेन्नई के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 544/2001) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 20-6-2002 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-40012/36/98-आई.आर. (डी.यू.)]

कुलदीप राय वर्मा, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 20th June, 2002

S.O. 2367.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 544/2001) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court Chennai now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Postal Deptt. and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 20-6-2002.

[No. L-40012/36/98-IR (DU)]

KULDIP RAI VERMA, Desk Officer

#### ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL  
TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, CHENNAI

Thursday, the 13th June, 2002

PRESENT:

K. KARTHIKEYAN, Presiding Officer

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE NO. 544/2001

(Tamil Nadu State Industrial Tribunal I. D. No. 150/98)

(In the matter of the dispute for adjudication under clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2(A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), between the workman Sri S. Raja and the Management of Superintendent of Post Offices, Nagapattinam Division.)

### BETWEEN

Sri. S. Raja : I Party/Workman

### AND

The Superintendent of Post Offices Nagapattinam Division : II Party/Management

### APPEARANCE :

For the Workman : Mrs. S. Jothivani and  
G. V. Kasturi,  
Advocates

For the Management : Mr. K. Rajendran  
SCGSC

The Govt. of India, Ministry of Labour in exercise of powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2(A) of Section 10 of Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), have referred the concerned Dispute for adjudication vide Order No. L-40012/36/98/IR(DU) dated 30-10-1998/13-11-1998.

This reference has been made earlier to the Tamil Nadu State Industrial Tribunal, Chennai, where the same was taken on file as I.D. No. 150/98. When the matter was pending enquiry in that Tribunal, the Government of India, Ministry of Labour was pleased to order transfer of this case also from the file of Tamil Nadu State Industrial Tribunal to this Tribunal for adjudication. On receipt of records from that Tamil Nadu State Industrial Tribunal, this case has been taken on file as I.D. No. 544/2001 and notices were sent to the counsel on record on either side, informing them about the transfer of this case to this Tribunal, with a direction to appear before this Tribunal on 12-03-2001 with their respective parties and to prosecute this case further. Accordingly, the learned counsel on either side along with their respective parties have appeared and prosecuted this case further.

When the matter came up before me for final hearing on 28-05-2002, upon perusing the Claim Statement, Counter Statement, the other material papers on record, after hearing the arguments advanced by the learned counsel on either side, and this matter having stood over till this date for consideration, this Tribunal has passed the following :—

### AWARD

The Industrial Dispute referred to in the above order of reference by the Central Govt. for adjudication by this Tribunal is as follows :—

“Whether the action of the management of Department of Posts, Nagapattinam Division, Nagapattinam in terminating the services of Shri S. Raja from the post of Extra Departmental Packer is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?”

2. The averments in the Claim Statement filed by the I Party/Workman Sri S. Raja (hereinafter refers to as Petitioner) are briefly as follows. —

The Petitioner was working as substitute Extra Departmental Agent at Ammaiappan and Manakkal Ayyampet Sub Post Office on various spells. The regular-holder of the post of Extra Departmental Packer, Manakkal Ayyampet has been promoted as Postman and the post fell vacant on a regular basis. The Petitioner is a qualified candidate to hold the post of Extra Departmental Packer. The Assistant Superintendent of post offices, Tiruvarur Sub-Division, Tiruvarur appointed the Petitioner as Extra Departmental Packer, Manakkal Ayyampet on 8-2-96 on a provisional basis. The petitioner was working as such continuously without any break from 8-2-96 to 24-3-97 for more than 240 days in a year. The Petitioner was paid the pay and allowances for the period he has employed by the Postmaster, Tiruvarur through acquittance rolls and establishment pay bills. The Petitioner's services were terminated by the Superintendent of Post Offices, Nagapattinam Division (hereinafter refers to as Respondent) w.e.f. 24-3-97 without issuing any notice or show cause or notice pay. The Respondent has failed to follow the provisions of Section 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, as such, the order of termination passed in an illegal and arbitrary exercise of power and in violation of principles of natural justice. The Respondent had exercised unfair labour practice in terminating the services of the Petitioner. So, it is *ab initio* void and is *non est* before the eye of law. So, the Petitioner is entitled for reinstatement in service with consequential relief, service and monetary benefits. Therefore, it is prayed that this Hon'ble Tribunal may be pleased to direct the Respondent to reinstate the Petitioner in service with all consequential service and monetary benefits.

3. The averments in the Counter Statement filed by the Superintendent of Post Offices, Nagapattinam Division (hereinafter refers to as Respondent) are briefly as follows :—

The post of Extra Departmental Packer, Manakkal Ayyampet sub Post Office fell vacant, since the permanent incumbent of the post was promoted to the cadre of Postman in January, 1996. The Assistant Superintendent of post Offices, Tiruvarur Sub-Division, as Appointing Authority initiated action to fill up the post on regular basis for which he called for applications through the Employment Exchange. Meanwhile, the process of

preparing dovetailed list of Extra Departmental Outsiders who had entered in the department prior to 11-02-88 and who had completed 240 days of service was in progress at the Office of the Superintendent of Post Offices, Nagapattinam Division, Nagapattinam in the year 1996-97. As per the administrative instructions, each and every vacant Extra Departmental Post should be filled in from amongst the candidates sponsored by the Employment Exchange and the candidates of the dovetailed list. In the meanwhile, the Assistant Superintendent of Post Offices, Tiruvarur Sub Division, had placed the Petitioner as Extra Departmental Packer, Manakkal Ayyampet Sub Post Office purely in a stop gap arrangement, with a view to maintain the services uninterruptedly. He, after observing the provisions of the rules envisaged in the P & T E. D. Agents (Conduct & Service) Rules, 1964, selected one Sri P. Muthukrishnan and appointed him as Extra Departmental Packer, Manakkal Ayyampet Sub Post Office, terminating the stop gap arrangement. The petitioner who is neither Employment Exchange candidate nor dovetailed list candidate deserves no consideration. The Superintendent of Post Offices, Nagapattinam Division, shown as Respondent in this case, is only the controlling authority after Assistant Superintendent of Post Offices, Tiruvarur, who is the appointing authority for the post of Extra Departmental Packer, Manakkal Ayyampet. The contention of the Petitioner that Assistant Superintendent of Post Offices, Tiruvarur Sub Division appointed the Petitioner as Extra Departmental Packer, Manakkal Ayyampet on 8-2-96 on a provisional basis is totally incorrect. The Petitioner has no claim over the post of Extra Departmental Packer, Manakkal Ayyampet, since he was temporarily appointed to that post on stop gap arrangement. No illegality or unfair labour practice whatsoever is involved in this case. In these circumstances, it is prayed that this Hon'ble Tribunal may be pleased to dismiss the claim of the Petitioner as fictitious, unsustainable and totally devoid of merits.

4 When the matter was taken up for enquiry, no one has been examined on either side as a witness and no documentary evidence has been exhibited on either side. The learned counsel on either side have advanced their respective arguments.

5. The point for my consideration is—

“Whether the action of the management of Department Posts, Nagapattinam Division, Nagapattinam in terminating the services of Shri S. Raja from the post of Extra Departmental Packer is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?”

Point.

It is admitted that the Petitioner was engaged as Extra Departmental Packer, Manakkal Ayyampet Sub Post Office by the Assistant Superintendent of Post Offices, Tiruvarur

Sub division, since that post fell vacant because of the permanent incumbent of the post was promoted to the cadre of Postman. It is the specific contention of the Petitioner that he was appointed in that post on 8-2-96 on a provisional basis and worked till 24-3-97, but the Respondent has clearly stated in its Counter Statement that to maintain the services uninterruptedly the Petitioner was placed as Extra Departmental Packer, Manakkal Ayyampet on 8-2-96 purely on a temporary stop gap arrangement. In proof of the contention of the Petitioner that he was appointed by the appointing authority on a provisional basis, no evidence either oral or documentary has been placed by the Petitioner before this Tribunal. It is admitted that the Assistant Superintendent of Post Offices, Tiruvarur had selected Sri P. Muthukrishnan and appointed him as Extra Departmental Packer, Manakkal Ayyampet and in pursuance of the same, the Respondent has terminated the services of the Petitioner. But he would contend that the said termination without any prior notice, or show cause or notice pay amounts to a violation of provisions of Section 25F of Industrial Disputes Act, apart from illegal and in violation of principles of natural justice. On the other hand, the Respondent would contend in the Counter Statement that the Assistant Superintendent of Post Offices, Tiruvarur Sub Division, after observing the provisions of Rules envisaged in P & T E.D. Agents (Conduct & Service) Rules, 1964, selected one Sri P. Muthukrishnan and appointed him as Extra Departmental Packer by initiating action to fill up the post on regular basis, as per the P & T E.D. Agents (Conduct & Service) Rules, 1964 and the Petitioner is neither a Employment Exchange candidate nor a dovetailed list candidate to be considered by the appointing authority for that post. This has not been disputed by the Petitioner. So as contended by the Respondent, having placed as Extra Departmental packer, Manakkal Ayyampet by the Assistant Superintendent of Post Offices, Tiruvarur Sub Division, purely on a stop gap arrangement, the Petitioner cannot have a claim over the post. The Xerox copies of the documents filed on the side of the Respondent, though they have not been exhibited, go to show that selection for the post of Extra Departmental Packer, Manakkal Ayyampet Sub Post Office has been done by the appointing authority by initiating action to fill up the post on regular basis by calling for applications through Employment Exchange and also considering the candidates mentioned in dovetailed list. From that it is seen that the action taken by the Respondent/Management in filling up the regular vacancy of the post of Extra Departmental Packer, Manakkal Ayyampet Sub Post Office, when it fell vacant since the permanent incumbent of the post was promoted as a Postman is legal and as per the Rule of P & T E.D. Agents (Conduct & Service) Rules, 1964. The learned counsel for Petitioner would argue that in pursuance of Central Administrative Tribunal, Bench judgment taking into consideration of the past services of the Petitioner, the Respondent department may be directed to include the



name of the Petitioner in the dovetailed list maintained by the department for consideration to fill up in the future permanent vacancies. For this, the learned counsel for the Respondent would argue that as per the direction of the Central Administrative Tribunal in its judgment, the Respondent department had prepared dovetailed list of Extra Departmental Outsiders who had entered into the department prior to 11-2-88 and who had completed 240 days of service and that was prepared in the year 1996-97 and it was a one time measure and one such list has been prepared as per the instructions of the Director General of Posts and as per the Circular issued by the Chief Postmaster General, Tamil Nadu Circle with regard to appointment of ED Posts dated 23-12-93. Provisional appointees for E.D. posts who were appointed after 11-2-88 and allowed to continue for more than 240 days will also be included in the dovetailed list based on their seniority, if they had put in not less than three years of service, as per Director General posts letter dated 18-5-75 and the Petitioner has not been appointed as a provisional appointee for ED post after 11-2-88. Hence, the argument advanced by the learned counsel on behalf of the Petitioner for inclusion of the name of the Petitioner in the dovetailed list cannot be complied with. The above said fact mentioned by the learned counsel for the Respondent has not been disputed by the Petitioner. The materials available in this case clearly show that the Petitioner was engaged in the Respondent department as Extra Departmental Packer only on a stop gap arrangement with a view to maintain the services uninterruptedly and having worked on that basis, the Petitioner cannot claim a right to that Post of Extra Departmental Packer, Manakkal Ayyampet Sub Post Office. Only after making a selection to fill up the post on regular basis, as per P & T E.D. Agents (Conduct & Service) Rules, 1964, the post of Extra Departmental Packer, Manakkal Ayyampet has been filled up by appointing one Sri Muthukumaran by the appointing authority, Assistant Superintendent of post offices, Tiruvarur Sub Division, by relieving the petitioner, who was holding that post purely on a temporary stop gap arrangement. Hence, it cannot be said that the action of the Respondent Department in disengaging the Petitioner/Workman Sri S. Raja from the post of Extra Departmental packer is illegal and unjustified. The Superintendent of Post offices, Nagapattinam Division, Nagapattinam has not terminated the services of the Petitioner, as mentioned in the Schedule of Reference for this industrial dispute. It is a consistent case of both the parties that the Assistant Superintendent of Post Offices, Tiruvarur Sub Division, is the appointing authority for the post of Extra Departmental Packer, Manakkal Ayyampet and the Superintendent of Post Offices, Nagapattinam Division is only the controlling authority of the Assistant Superintendent of Post Offices, Tiruvarur. Thus, the point is answered accordingly.

6. In the result, an Award is passed holding that the 1 party/Workman Sri S. Raja is not entitled to any relief. No Cost.

(Dictated to the Stenographer, transcribed and typed by him, corrected and pronounced by me in the open court on this day the 13th June, 2002.)

K. KARTHIKEYAN, Presiding Officer

#### Witnesses Examined :-

On either side : None

Exhibits marked on either side : Nil

नई दिल्ली, 21 जून, 2002

का. आ. 2368.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार डाक विभाग के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण चेन्नई के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 555/2001) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 21-6-2002 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-40011/40/2000—आई.आर. (डी.यू.)]  
कुलदीप राय वर्मा, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 21st June, 2002

S. O. 2368.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 555/2001) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court Chennai now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Postal Deptt. and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 21-6-2002

[No. L-40011/40/2000—IR (DU)]

KULDIP RAI VERMA, Desk Officer

#### ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL  
TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, CHENNAI

Wednesday, the 5th June, 2002

Present : K. KARTHIKEYAN, Presiding Officer

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE No. 555/2001

(In the matter of the dispute for adjudication under clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2 (A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), between the Workman Sri M. Panneerselvam and the Management of the Senior Superintendent of Post Offices, Pondicherry Division)

**BETWEEN**

Sri M. Pannerselvam : I Party/Workman

**AND**The Senior Superintendent : II Party/Management  
of Post Offices,  
Pondicherry Division**APPEARANCE :**For the Workman : Mrs. S. Jothivani,  
AdvocateFor the Management : Mr. D. Nandakumar,  
Advocate

The Govt. of India, Ministry of Labour in exercise of powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2(A) of Section 10 of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), have referred the concerned dispute for adjudication vide Order No. L-40011/40/2000/IR(DU) dated 09-02-2001

On receipt of Order of reference from the Government of India, Ministry of Labour, this case has been taken on file as I.D. No. 555/2001 and notices were sent to the parties to the dispute with a direction to appear before this Tribunal on 19-04-2001 and to file their respective Claim Statement and Counter Statement. Accordingly, the learned counsel on either side on record along with their respective parties have appeared and filed the claim statement and counter statement respectively.

When the matter came up before me for final hearing on 30-04-2002, upon perusing the Claim Statement, Counter Statement, the other material papers on record, documentary evidence let in on either side, after hearing the arguments advanced by the learned counsel on either side and this matter having stood over till this date for consideration, this Tribunal has passed the following :—

**AWARD**

The Industrial Dispute referred to in the above order of reference by the Central Govt. for adjudication by this Tribunal is as follows :—

“Whether the termination and non-regularisation of Sri M. Pannerselvam of the Saram Post Office, Pondicherry is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?”

2. The averments in the Claim Statement filed by the I Party/Workman Sri M. Pannerselvam (hereinafter refers to as Petitioner) are briefly as follows :—

The Petitioner was working as Extra Departmental Branch Post Master at Panchalam Post Office, Tindivanam Taluk for various spells on provisional basis. He had rendered his duties while in service to the entire satisfaction of his superiors without any blemish. Initially he was appointed as Extra Departmental Branch Post Master on

provisional basis by an order issued by the II Party/Senior Superintendent of Post Offices, Pondicherry Division in June, 1994 consequent on the selection made by the II Party (hereinafter refers to as Respondent) on 6-6-1994. Subsequently, the Respondent issued a memo to the Petitioner stating that the appointment of the Petitioner was tenable till disciplinary proceedings against Mr. K. Gnanam, the regular holder of the post is finally disposed of. The Respondent had issued an order dated 17-11-94 and the said Mr. K. Gnanam was reinstated on 21-11-1994. Later the Petitioner was employed as E.D. Packer at Saram S.O. and EDDA at Saram S.O. for nearly 600 days in the leave vacancies from February, 1995 to September, 1996. Subsequently, the Petitioner was appointed as Extra Departmental Branch Post Master w.e.f. 24-09-96 at Panchalam B.O., as such, he was working for nearly two years till 21-06-98. Subsequently, the Petitioner was appointed again as EDBPM at Panchalam B.O. w.e.f. 23-06-98. No formal appointment order was issued to the Petitioner, but the Petitioner was paid allowances and other benefits. He was paid bonus for the period 1997-98 on 25-09-98. When the Petitioner was in service, the Respondent called for candidates from the Employment Exchange for considering them for appointment for the post of Extra Departmental Branch Post Master, Panchalam B.O. It is an illegal and arbitrary exercise of power without considering the Petitioner, who was holding that post at that time. Consequent on the selection one Mr. G. Mohandas had joined as Extra Departmental Branch Post Master, Panchalam B.O. and the Petitioner was terminated from service w.e.f. 26-09-98 without any orders. The Petitioner challenged the selection of the said Mr. G. Mohandas before the Administrative Tribunal in O.A.No. 144/99. The Hon'ble Tribunal was pleased to dismiss the same by an order dated 18-04-2000 for the reason that the said Mr. G. Mohandas was a better qualified candidate comparing to the merits of the candidates appeared for selection. Considering services rendered by the Petitioner and the suitability of the Petitioner, he was appointed as Extra Departmental Branch Post Master, Panchalam B.O. for nearly two years from 24-09-96 to 26-09-98 continuously, as such, the Petitioner had worked for more than 240 days in a year and he is governed by the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. So, he is entitled for notice of termination as required under section 25F to the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. The failure of the Respondent in complying with the provisions of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 amounts to violation of the provisions of that Act. The services of the Petitioner has been terminated on the pretext that he has been appointed as stop gap arrangement which is an illegal and arbitrary exercise of power by the Respondent. Considering the services rendered by the Petitioner, the Respondent ought to have regularised his services. On the other hand, the action of the Respondent in terminating the services of the Petitioner is an unfair labour practice and it amounts to violation of principles of natural justice. Aggrieved by the

action of the Respondent in terminating the services of the Petitioner, the Petitioner has raised an industrial dispute before the Regional Labour Commissioner (Central), Chennai, but it ended in a failure of conciliation. On submission of failure of conciliation report by the conciliating authority, the Govt. has referred this dispute to this Hon'ble Tribunal for adjudication. Hence, it is prayed that this Tribunal may be pleased to pass an Award holding that the termination of the Petitioner from service by the Respondent as illegal and arbitrary and direct the Respondent to reinstate the Petitioner in service with all service and monetary benefits.

3. The II Party/The Senior Superintendent of Post Offices, Pondicherry Division had filed a Counter Statement, the Respondent herein. The averments in the Counter Statement are briefly as follows :—

The Petitioner was appointed as Extra Departmental Branch Post Master on provisional basis by the Respondent by an order dated 20-09-94, consequent on the vacancy caused due to the put off duty and disciplinary proceedings initiated against the regular BPM i.e. Mr. K. Gnanam, in connection with frauds committed by him in S.B./R.D. accounts. In that provisional appointment order, it was clearly stated that the appointment of the Petitioner was a provisional one and it is tenable till the disciplinary proceedings against Mr. K. Gnanam was finally disposed of. It was further emphasized that if it was decided to take Mr. K. Gnanam back into service, the provisional appointment made would be terminated even without notice. The Petitioner was directed to sign the duplicate copy of the memo, if the conditions were acceptable to him. Accordingly, the Petitioner signed the duplicate copy with endorsement 'accepted'. After completion of disciplinary proceedings the said Mr. K. Gnanam was awarded with the punishment of debarring him from appearing departmental examination for a period of three years and reinstated into service w.e.f. 21-11-1994 by a memo dated 17-11-94 issued by the Respondent. Hence, the services of the Petitioner was terminated. The Petitioner's claim for absorption in the department stating that he had worked as E.D. Packer and also EDDA at Saram S.O. in leave vacancies for nearly 600 days from February, 1995 to September, 1996 is not legal, as it was only in the leave vacancies of Extra Departmental Agents. Mr. K. Gnanam was placed off duty for the 2nd time w.e.f. 24-09-96 forenoon, since he had committed frauds again. So, the Respondent directed his subordinate i.e. The Assistant Superintendent of Post Offices, Tindivanam Sub-Division to serve the put off duty memo dated 20-09-96 to Sri K. Gnanam and relieve him from the post of BPM. After relieving Mr. K. Gnanam from the post, the Petitioner was again put in-charge of the Panchalam B.O. w.e.f. 24-09-96 Forenoon. This was only a stop gap arrangement and not even a provisional appointment. The question of issuing a formal appointment order did not arise at all, as the Petitioner

was not selected for the 2nd time either by going through Employment Exchange procedures or by issuing local notification. He was just allowed to act as BPM Panchalam B.O. purely on temporary arrangement just like a leave substitute. The Petitioner was paid monthly allowances as applicable to the post. The productivity linked bonus was paid to the Petitioner on 25-09-98 inadvertently. It was subsequently recovered from him and credited into accounts on 05-10-98. The said Mr. K. Gnanam was again reinstated into service on 22-06-98 relieving the Petitioner. The said Mr. K. Gnanam was transferred as Extra Departmental Mail Carrier, Kappalambadi BO involving lesser responsibilities and he joined as EDMC w.e.f. 23-06-98 forenoon. Only on that day a clear and regular vacancy of the post of BPM Panchalam BO arose. The Assistant Superintendent of Post Offices, Tindivanam Sub Division again for the 3rd time transferred the charge of BPM Panchalam BO to the Petitioner w.e.f. 23-06-98 forenoon. With a view to fill up this clear and regular vacancy of the post of BPM, Panchalam BO, the Respondent addressed the Employment Exchange, Villupuram Dist. on 6-7-98 requesting to sponsor candidates for appointment to the post of Extra Departmental Branch Post Master. Local notification was also issued on 24-09-98. 8 candidates were sponsored by the Employment Exchange and the Petitioner was one among them. Nine applications were received in response to local notification. Applications in the prescribed form were sent to all eight Employment Exchange candidates for submission back to the office for consideration. The Petitioner also was supplied with the prescribed form of application as one of the sponsored candidates by the Employment Exchange. Out of the 8 sponsored candidates only three candidates applied for the post including the Petitioner. For all those three applied candidates sponsored by the Employment Exchange and nine notification candidates, interview letters were sent directing them to attend the interview on 14-12-98. The Assistant Superintendent of Post Offices, Tindivanam Sub Division was directed by a letter dated 24-09-98 to terminate the Petitioner from the local arrangement made on 26.03.98 to enable him to compete in the selection by appearing in the interview. Accordingly, the Petitioner was relieved from the post of BPM Panchalam BO. That termination took place on 26-09-98 for the 3rd time. The question of giving formal termination order does not arise at all as he was working only as an ED Outsider/substitute in place of vacancy. In the interview held on 14-12-98, one Mr. G. Mohandas was selected and appointed as BPM w.e.f. 18-12-98 forenoon on a regular basis, as he stood more meritorious with a score of 317/500 marks in SSLC in the first appearance than the Petitioner who had secured only 243/500 marks in SSLC that too in two attempts. The Petitioner is not correct to claim absorption only on the basis of having worked as ED packer and EDDA at Saram S.O. from February, 1995 to September, 1996. He worked as ED Agent only in leave vacancies. The leave substitutes

are only treated as ED Outsiders and they are nominated by regular ED agent, who is proceeding on leave. The leave substitutes/ED Outsiders are not nominated by the department. As such, the ED Outsider can work in any number of leave vacancies for any number of years and it will not bind the department in any way to give him appointment as there is no employer and employee relationship between the ED Outsider and the department. When a BPM is placed off duty, Mail Overseer will be posted as BPM to look after the duties for a short term or a person will be appointed provisionally till the finalisation of the disciplinary proceedings against the regular incumbent. Accordingly, the Petitioner was put in-charge of BPM, Panchalam BO simply on the ground that he had already worked as BPM Panchalam BO from 20-6-94 to 21-11-94 on provisional basis. The Chief Post Master General, Tamil Nadu Circle, Chennai, after a deep discussion had clearly brought out in his letter dated 23-12-1993 about the appointment of ED posts, considering the casual labourers and ED Outsiders as only a substitute in a ED vacancy who works only as an agent of the permanent incumbent. In the case of ED Outsiders, there is no employee-employer relationship between them and the department. Though the Petitioner was not nominated by the regular incumbent on each and every occasion, which cannot be done since the regular incumbent was under put off duty. Here also the work of the Petitioner should be treated as that of an outsider working in leave vacancy, as it was not a clear and regular vacancy. The question of giving termination order would arise only, if an appointment order was also issued. The Petitioner was not issued with any formal appointment order by the 2nd and 3rd time, so the termination orders were also not issued. Considering the Petitioner on the basis of having worked for more than 240 days will not arise at all in this case. ED Outsiders engaged before 11-02-1988 and completed 240 days in any two years will alone need to be considered for appointment as per the Chief Post Master General, Tamil Nadu Circle, Chennai letter dated 23-12-1999. The fact of non-existence of employee and employer relationship between the Petitioner and the Respondent is clearly proved and hence, it will not in any way bind the Respondent for giving appointment to the Petitioner. Thus, the services of the Petitioner terminated by the Respondent on the basis that he worked only in stop gap arrangement is fully legal and not arbitrary exercise of powers. In view of the above position, the Petitioner's service was not regularised by the Respondent. The violation of Section 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 does not arise because, there was no binding relation between the Petitioner and the Respondent. Hence, the action of the Respondent is only legal and not arbitrary exercise of powers. The reinstatement of the Petitioner in service of the Respondent as BPM, Panchalam BO will not arise at all, as the meritorious candidate Sri G. Mohandas was selected and appointed as BPM on regular basis w.e.f. 18-12-98 forenoon as per rules

of the department. The term reinstatement itself will apply only in case of those between whom the binding relation exists. Further the Petitioner filed a O.A.No. 144/99 in the Central Administrative Tribunal, Chennai Bench against the selection of Mr. G.Mohandas. The Hon'ble Tribunal was pleased to dismiss that O.A. by its judgement dated 14-04-2000. In that judgement itself, the Hon'ble Tribunal has observed that 'there is no infirmity in the order passed by the Respondent, since the Petitioner had put in-charge of the office whenever the incumbent of the office was on put off duty and that too on stop gap arrangement and no order of appointment either provisionally or on stop gap arrangement has been issued and as such the Petitioner has no right to hold the post when a regular selection is made for the vacancy and more meritorious candidate than the Petitioner has been selected and appointed. The Petitioner is not entitled for either appointment to the post of BPM, Panchalam BO or for consideration in any other selection of Extra Departmental Agents in regular appointment because, he worked in the department as mentioned above. The Petitioner has no legal right for his claim. Hence, the case has to be dismissed. Hence, it is prayed that this Hon'ble Tribunal may be pleased to dismiss the claim of the Petitioner.

4. When the matter was taken up for enquiry, no one has been examined on either side as a witness. Documents filed on either side have been marked with the consent of the counsel on either side as EX.W1 to W6 and M1 to M8. The learned counsel on either side have advanced their respective arguments.

5. The point for my consideration is—

“Whether the termination and non-regularisation of Sri M. Panneerselvam of the Saram Post Office, Pondicherry is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?”

Point :—

It is admitted that the Petitioner Sri M. Panneerselvam was engaged by the Respondent as an Extra Departmental Branch Post Master on provisional basis, consequent on the vacancy caused due to the put off duty and disciplinary proceedings initiated against the regular BPM Mr. K. Gnanam. It is further admitted that for the 2nd time also, when the said Sri K. Gnanam was placed off duty, the Petitioner was again put in-charge of that post only as a stop gap arrangement and it is not even a provisional appointment. It is not disputed that the Petitioner was not given any formal appointment order and he was not selected for that post by going through Employment Exchange procedures or by issuing local notification and it was only on a temporary arrangement, he was allowed to act as BPM, Panchalam BO. Ex.W3 is the xerox copy of the order dated 20-09-94 passed by the Senior Superintendent

of Post Offices, Pondicherry Division. As per that order, the Petitioner was offered a provisional appointment till the disciplinary proceedings against Mr. K. Gnanam, regular incumbent to the post has been finally disposed of. In that order itself, it is mentioned that if ever it is decided to take Sri K. Gnanam back into service, the provisional appointment will be terminated without notice. It is further mentioned therein that the Senior Superintendent of Post Offices, Pondicherry Division reserves right to terminate the provisional appointment at any time before the period mentioned above, without notice and without assigning any reason. It is the specific averment in the Counter Statement of the Respondent that the Petitioner had signed the duplicate copy of the offer for a provisional appointment with an endorsement "accepted" and it is not denied by the Petitioner. It is not disputed that when the disciplinary action has been initiated against the said Sri K. Gnanam, the regular BPM for the 2nd time, the Petitioner was allowed to act as BPM, Panchalam BO purely on a temporary arrangement as a stop gap arrangement and no order of provisional appointment was issued to the Petitioner for the same. It is the contention of the Respondent that the said Sri K. Gnanam was reinstated into service on 22-06-98, relieving the Petitioner therein and later the said Mr. K. Gnanam was transferred as Extra Departmental Mail Carrier, Kappalambadi BO with lesser responsibilities and after he took the charge of the transferred charge on 23-06-98 forenoon, a clear regular vacancy of the post of BPM, Panchalam BO arose and at that time also the Petitioner was engaged as BPM, Panchalam BO and after regular selection has been made, one Sri G Mohandas was appointed as BPM with effect from 18-12-98 forenoon on a regular basis and that the Petitioner also had competed in that selection, but not selected. Challenging that selection, the Petitioner has filed a O.A.No. 144/99 before the Central Administrative Tribunal, Madras Bench, and the same was dismissed. The xerox copy of that order is Ex.M8. It is clearly observed by the Hon'ble Central Administrative Tribunal in the above mentioned order as follows:—

"It is true that the applicant has put on charge of the office, whenever the incumbent of the office was put off duty. But no order of appointment either provisionally or on stop gap arrangement has been issued, whenever the applicant has been asked to take charge of the office. As such, the applicant has no right to hold the post when regular selection is made for the vacancy. More so, the applicant himself is one of the candidates in the selection process and he has also been given an opportunity to compete with other candidates and having obtained lesser marks in the SSLC and having passed the SSLC examination in two attempts, he has not been selected. Hence, in the selection of Sri G Mohandas on the basis that he secured more marks and passed the SSLC in the first attempt, there is no infirmity in the order passed."

This order passed by the Hon'ble Central Administrative Tribunal, Madras Bench has not been challenged by the Petitioner. It is still binding on him. Ex. W1 is the xerox copy of the call letter for selection issued to the Petitioner. Ex. W2 is the xerox copy of the letter sent by the Respondent to the Petitioner in the month of June, 1994 informing him that he may await further instructions from the Assistant Superintendent of Post Offices, Tindivanam Sub-Division in respect of his provisional selection as BPM, Panchalam a/w Saram. That was issued to him prior to the offer letter issued to the Petitioner under Ex. W3. Ex. W4 is the xerox copy of the charge report for having taken charge by the Petitioner from Sri K. Gnanam on 21-11-94. Ex. W5 is the xerox copy of the acquittance roll for Panchalam Branch BO Post Office showing payment made to the Petitioner as BPM towards his pay of Rs. 1865/- on 25-9-98. Ex. W6 is the xerox copy of the certificate issued by Sub Postmaster, Saram dated 29-09-98 giving particulars of work of the Petitioner in the leave vacancy of ED Packer, Saram and EDDA, Saram from February, 1995 to September, 1996. All these documents establish that the Petitioner was never appointed by the Respondent as a regular incumbent in a regular vacancy or post. On the other hand, the documents available in this case clearly show that the Petitioner was allowed to act as BPM, Panchalam BO purely on a temporary arrangement just like leave substitute and he was put in-charge of the office, whenever the incumbent of the office was put off duty and no order of appointment either provisionally or on stop gap arrangement has been issued, whenever the Petitioner has been asked to take charge of the office. As such, the Petitioner has no right to hold the post when regular selection is made for the vacancy. It is not disputed that though the Petitioner was given an opportunity to compete with other candidates, he has not been selected, since the same was offered to a candidate more meritorious than the Petitioner to the known procedure of selection by the Respondent. That was why, the attempt made by the Petitioner before the Central Administrative Tribunal in challenging that selection has been ended in a failure, as it is seen from EX. M8.

6. The learned counsel for the Petitioner would argue that no notice was given under section 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 to the Petitioner by the Respondent before terminating the services of the Petitioner. So, it is a violation of the said provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act. She would further argue that if the permanent vacancy is not available, the Respondent may be directed to include the name of the Petitioner in the dovetailed list, considering his earlier services in the department to provide him a post as and when vacancy arises and the system of maintaining dovetailed list is still in force. The Petitioner through his counsel has also filed a memo stating that the Respondent is following the procedure of placing the Extra Departmental Agents, who had put in 240 days of continuous service in

any two years in the department as an Extra Departmental Agent either on provisional basis or as an outsider and this Petitioner had put in more than 240 days of service continuously in a consecutive period of two years and hence, the Petitioner may be considered by the Respondent for placing his name in the dovetailed list of candidates awaiting absorption as Extra Departmental Agent and provide an employment of Extra Departmental Agent in the vacancy arises at the earliest. For that memo, the Respondent has filed a reply memo stating that the Petitioner had worked as Extra Departmental Agent only in leave vacancies and that the leave substitutes are only treated as ED Outsiders and they are nominated by the regular ED agent, who is proceeding on leave and that leave substitute/ED Outsiders are not nominated by the department and that as such, ED Outsider can work in any number of leave vacancies for any number of years and it will not bind the department in any way to give him appointment, as there is no employee-employer relationship between the ED Outsider and the department.

7. The above said fact in the reply memo mentioned by the Respondent has not been denied. The records available on either side clearly show that the Petitioner was never employed by the Respondent/Department, as the leave substitute is nominated by the regular ED agent, when he is proceeding on leave. It is also not denied that the Petitioner was not nominated by the department by giving a written order, but he was engaged only to meet the contingencies, till a regular incumbent has been appointed to that post. So, under such circumstances, the Petitioner's claim that he had worked more than 240 days consecutively in a period of two years will not at all arise for consideration because, admittedly, the Petitioner was not engaged prior to 11-02-1988 and completed 240 days in two years of service as a pre-requisite mentioned in the letter dated 23-12-1993 of the Chief Post Master General, Tamil Nadu Circle. The Chief Post Master General, Tamil Nadu Circle had issued a circular dated 23-12-1993 in pursuance of the judgment given by the Hon'ble Central Administrative Tribunal, Madras. The xerox copy of the same is Ex.M1. While dealing with the subject of appointment to ED posts by considering the casual labourers and ED Outsiders, certain norms have been mentioned therein. As per that letter, the Chief Post Master General, Tamil Nadu Circle has issued instructions stating that provisional appointees for ED posts who are appointed after 11-02-1988 and allowed to continue for more than 240 days will also be included in the dovetailed list based on their seniority, if they have put in not less than three years of service as per the Director General of Posts letter dated 18-05-1979 and that these provisional appointees who have completed 240 days in any two years after 11-02-1988 will also be included in the dovetailed list based on their seniority. So, as per this

direction of the Chief Post Master General, Tamil Nadu Circle, the request of the Petitioner to include his name in the dovetailed list cannot be considered, because admittedly, he is not a provisional appointee, who had completed 240 days in any two years after 11-02-1988. So, under such circumstances, as it is rightly argued by the learned counsel for the Respondent on the basis of the Petitioner had served in the Respondent/ Department, he cannot claim a right to be absorbed as an employee of the Respondent/Department. Further, he cannot also request this Tribunal to issue a direction to the Respondent to include his name in the dovetailed list. So, under such circumstances, there is no question of termination of service of the Petitioner Sri M. Panneerselvam by the Respondent and there is no question of regularisation of his service in the Saram Post Office, Pondicherry. Hence, it cannot be said that the Respondent has taken illegal action in terminating the services of the Petitioner from Saram Post Office, Pondicherry without regularising his service and it cannot be said to be an action taken by the Respondent as unjustified one. Hence, the concerned workman Sri M. Panneerselvam is not entitled to any relief. Thus, the point is answered accordingly.

8. In the result, an Award is passed holding that the I Party/Workman Sri M. Panneerselvam is not entitled to any relief. No Cost.

(Dictated to the Stenographer, transcribed and typed by him, corrected and pronounced by me in the open court on this day the 5th June, 2002.)

K. KARTHIKEYAN, Presiding Officer

#### Witnesses Examined :—

On either side : None

Exhibits marked :—

For the I Party/Workman :—

Ex. No.	Date	Description
W1	13.05.94	Xerox copy of the call letter for selection.
W2	.06.94	Xerox copy of the order of selection
W3	20.09.94	Xerox copy of the order of appointment.
W4	21.11.94	Xerox copy of the charge report for Reinstatement
W5	09-09.98	Xerox copy of the pay roll
W6	29.09.98	Xerox copy of the service certificate.

**For the II Part/Management:—**

M1	23.12.93	Xerox copy of the letter for appointment To ED Posts
M2	28.09.94	Xerox copy of the memo issued by the Senior Superintendent of Post Offices, Pondicherry to the Post Master, Tindivanam.
M3	Nil	Xerox copy of the memo issued to the Assistant Superintendent of Post Offices, Tindivanam by the Senior Superintendent of Post Offices, Pondicherry
M4	24.07.98	Xerox copy of the memo issued to the Assistant Superintendent of Post Offices, Tindivanam by the Senior Superintendent of Post Offices, Pondicherry
M5	Nil	Xerox copy of the SSLC mark sheet of the Pctitioner
M6	Nil	Xerox copy of the SSLC marksheet of G. Mohandass
M7	16.12.98	Xerox copy of the selection letter from the Respondent To Sri G. Mohandass
M8	18.04.2000	Xerox copy of the order in O.A.No. 144/99.

नई दिल्ली, 21 जून, 2002

**का. आ. 2369.**—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार ई. सी. एल. के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, असनसोल के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 41/1997) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 20-6-2002 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[ सं. एल-22012/571/95—आई.आर. (सी. II) ]

एन. पी. केशवन, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 21st June, 2002

**S.O. 2369.**—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 41/1997) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Asansol as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of ECL and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 20-6-2002.

[No. L-22012/571/95-IR (C-II)]

N.P. KESAVAN, Desk Officer

**ANNEXURE**

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM -LABOUR COURT, ASANSOL

**PRESENT:**

Shri RAMJI PANDEY, Presiding Officer

REFERENCE NO. 41 OF 1997

**PARTIES:**

KHAS KAJORA COLLIERY M/s. E. C. L

.....Management

**Versus**

Shri NARU DHANGAR

.....Workman

**APPEARANCES:**

For the Management —Shri P. K. Das, Advocate.

For the Workman (Union) —Shri M. Mukherjee, Advocate.

Industry: Coal.

State: West Bengal.

Date: 15-05-2002

**AWARD**

In exercise of powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section (2A) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, Govt. of India through the Ministry of Labour vide it's Order No. L-22012/571/95-IRCM-II dated 11/15-07-1997, has referred the following dispute for adjudication by this Tribunal:

“Whether the action of the management of Khas Kajora Colliery under Kajora Area of ECL in dismissing Shri Naru Dhangar, Driller from services w.e.f. 14/16-06-1994 is legal and justified? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?”

In response to the summon both the parties appeared and filed their respective written statements. The management appeared through Shri P. K. Das, Advocate and the Union appeared through Shri M. Mukherjee, Advocate.

Facts of the case in brief is that the workman c.g. Shri Naru Dhangar, was a permanent employee of M/s. ECL, working as Driller at Khas Kajora Colliery. The workman became absent from his duty from 05-04-1993 to 10-05-1994 for which he was charge sheeted by the management and after holding domestic enquiry he has been dismissed from service.

The case of the management in brief is that the workman became absent without any authority or permission from any competent officer of the management. The absence of workman was unauthorised and he is a habitual absentee. A valid domestic enquiry was conducted in which the workman participated and during enquiry the misconduct of the workman was established and hence he has been dismissed from service. The order of dismissal is justified and does not require interference by this Tribunal.

The case of the workman (union), in brief, is that the workman became ill from 06-04-1993 and he was suffering from Jaundice. He was under treatment of Dr. K. P. Gupta and when recovered on 18-04-1994 he reported for his duty but he was not permitted to join duty and subsequently on 10-05-1995 he was served a charge sheet. The workman submitted his explanation stating therein that due to illness he could not resume his duty and became absent for such a longer period. He also submitted a medical certificate but the explanation of the workman was not accepted and a domestic enquiry was conducted against him. Further case of workman is that the order of dismissal is illegal, unjustified and unwarranted because due to illness the workman was unable to attend his duty. It has been further stated that in any view of the matter the order of dismissal is too severe punishment which is disproportionate to the alleged misconduct.

During hearing on the point of fairness of domestic enquiry the Union (workman) did not challenge the same rather it was admitted on behalf of the workman that the enquiry were conducted in his presence and hence the enquiry has been already held to be valid.

Learned Lawyer for both the parties made submissions on the correctness of finding of enquiry officer and the quantum of punishment. Learned Lawyer for the management made submission that from the enquiry report it is clear that the workman had taken the plea that he was ill and when he recovered on 18-04-1994 his family members became ill but no medical certificate was filed by the workman to prove the fact that his family members were ill. And hence the absence of workman for that period was unauthorised and the finding of enquiry officer to that effect is based on the evidence of workman. And hence the order of dismissal is justified. Learned lawyer further submitted that the workman was habitual absentee and hence only the punishment of dismissal was the proper punishment.

On the other hand, Learned Lawyer for the workman has submitted that the workman was ill from 05-04-1993 to 18-04-1994 and he has submitted a medical report in support

thereof and during enquiry also the enquiry officer has found that medical certificate supports the fact that the workman was ill from 05-04-1993 to 18-04-1994. Learned Lawyer further submitted that although the workman has taken the plea that his family members were also ill but the illness of his family members was an additional ground of his absence. Even if the fact of illness of his family members is disbelieved due to absence of any medical certificate the illness of workman itself was sufficient reason to explain his absence, and hence there was no misconduct on the part of the workman, and he did not deserve any kind of punishment.

After hearing both the parties I perused the findings of Enquiry Officer. The Enquiry Officer has found that the absence of workman is unauthorised only because he could not produce the medical certificate regarding the illness of any member of his family. The Enquiry Officer himself has admitted that medical certificate produced by the workman supported the fact that the workman was ill from 05-04-1993 to 18-04-1994. Learned Lawyer for the workman correctly submitted that the fact of illness of the family members of the workman was an additional ground and due to absence of medical report regarding illness of the family members, the fact of illness of the workman could not be disbelieved. And hence I find and hold that the workman cannot resume his duty from 05-04-1993 to 18-04-1994 due to his illness which was a just cause to become absent. I also find that the workman has stated before Enquiry Officer that during his illness there was none to help him and hence he could not inform the management regarding his illness earlier. This facts has not been disbelieved by the Enquiry Officer.

Although the management has taken the plea that the workman was a habitual absentee but no specific period of absence has been incorporated in the charge sheet and hence the charge sheet issued to the workman regarding habitual absence is vague. Moreover, as discussed above, the management has failed to prove any misconduct on the part of the workman and it has been held that the absence of workman from 05-04-1993 to 18-04-1994 was justified and hence in the present case the workman can not be punished for any previous absence. It has been pleaded by the workman that when he became fit, reported for his duty on 18-04-1994 and this plea of workman has not been denied by the management and as such absence of workman from 19-04-1994 to 10-05-1994 is itself explained.

In view of the above discussion I find that the order of dismissal is illegal and unjustified and hence the order of dismissal is set aside and the management is directed to reinstate the workman with back wages. In the above manner the award is passed.

RAMJEE PANDEY, Presiding Officer



नई दिल्ली, 21 जून, 2002

का. आ. 2370.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एम. सी. एल. प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, भुवनेश्वर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 29/2001) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 20-6-2002 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[ सं. एल-22012/206/96-आई.आर. (सी-II) ]

एन. पी. केशवन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 21st June, 2002

S.O. 2370.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 29/2001) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Bhubaneswar as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of MCL and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 20-6-2002.

[No. L-22012/206/96-IR (C-II)]

N. P. KESAVAN, Desk Officer

**ANNEXURE**CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-  
CUM-LABOUR COURT

BHUBANESWAR

**PRESENT:**

Shri S.K. Dhal, OSJS (Sr. Branch)  
Presiding Officer, C.G.I.T.-cum-Labour  
Court, Bhubaneswar.

**Tr. INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE CASE NO. 29/2001****Date of Conclusion of the hearing - 30th May, 2002****Date of Passing Award — 10th June, 2002****BETWEEN**

The Management of the General Manager,  
Orient Area, Mahanadi Coal Fields Ltd.,  
P.O. Brajarajnagar, Dist. Jharsuguda.

... 1st Party-Management.

**AND**

Their Workman, Shri Durga Munda,  
P. O. Gandagara, Dist Jharsuguda

... 2nd Party-Union.

**APPEARANCES:**

Shri Santosh Kumar Panigrahi,  
Legal Inspector (Tr)

... For the 1st Party-  
Management.

None

For the 2nd Party-  
Workmen.**AWARD**

The Government of India in the Ministry of Labour, in exercise of powers conferred by Clause (d) of Sub-section (1) and Sub-section (2A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) have referred the following dispute for adjudication vide their Order No. L-22012/206/96-IR (C-II), dated 8-6-1997 :—

“Whether the action of the Management of Orient Area, Mahanadi Coal Fields Limited, Brajarajnagar, in terminating the services of Shri Durga Munda, General Mazdoor with effect from 7-2-1993 is legal and justified? If not, to what relief are the workman entitled?”

2. The case of the 2nd Party is that he was employed as Drill Helper in the Mine No. 4 of the 1st Party-Management. He was posted in the place where there was heavy dust and smoke. No safety measure was taken by the 1st Party-Management. As he worked continuously there for a long period he suffered from the chest pain and was forced to undergo treatment by the Medical Officers of the 1st party-Management and by private doctors also. He remained on leave, but when he went to join, the 1st Party-Management refused to allow him to work. He was admitted in the hospital of the 1st Party-Management at Brajarajnagar on 7-11-1992 and was discharged on 11-11-1992. His absence was intimated to the 1st Party-Management. But the 1st Party-Management without any reason terminated his services on 13-11-1992. He raised a dispute, reconciliation failed thereafter the present reference has been made. The 2nd Party in his Claim Statement has prayed to declare the order of termination as illegal and he has also prayed for reinstatement with full back wages.

3. The 1st Party-Management has filed their Written Statement. The 2nd Party while in service remained absent frequently, so he was served with a chargesheet on 28-4-1992 under Clause 26.24 of the Certified Standing Order. Copy of the chargesheet was also served on him and Domestic Enquiry was conducted after appointment of Enquiry Officer. This fact was also intimated to the 2nd party on 22-5-1992. One Mr. N. P. Patra was the Enquiry Officer and one Shri S. K. Sinha as the Conducting Officer. The 2nd Party had participated in the enquiry with the help of his co-worker and admitted the charges levelled against him. The Enquiry Officer submitted his report on 5-9-1992. Thereafter the Disciplinary Authority after perusal of the Enquiry report finding the 2nd Party guilty passed the order of termination on 6-2-1993 after serving copy to the 2nd party. It was specifically pleaded that the 2nd Party was a habitual unauthorized absentee.

4. On the above pleadings of the parties, the following issues have been settled :

1. Whether the action of the Management of Orient Area Mahanadi Coal Field Limited, Brajarajnagar,

in terminating the services of Shri Durga Munda with effect from 7-2-1993 is legal and justified.

2. To what relief the workman is entitled?

5. The 2nd party-Workman initially had examined himself as Workman Witness No. 1 on 1-12-1999. He also examined another witness on 4-1-2000 but the evidence in the examination in chief was not concluded. The 1st Party-Management has filed affidavit in support of their evidence.

### FINDINGS

6. Before expressing any opinion on the merit of the Issues, it may be stated here that the 2nd Party had examined himself as Workman Witness No. 1 on 1-12-1999. Thereafter he examined another witness on 4-1-2000 but the evidence of that witness was not concluded. The 2nd party was given many adjournments to examine his witness who was examined in part on his behalf. But the 2nd Party remained absent and did not avail the opportunity. So the evidence of the 2nd party was treated as closed. He also did not cross-examine the witness of the 1st Party-Management who had filed the affidavit.

### ISSUE NO. I

7 The case of the 2nd party is that his termination is illegal. He has admitted in the cross examination that he had received the chargesheet. He has stated that he did not attend the enquiry but his signature was taken by force. The evidence tendered on behalf of the 1st Party-Management through affidavit reveals that, the 2nd party had attended the enquiry and admitted his guilt. The evidence of the 1st Party-Management has not been shaken in the cross-examination. Moreover, the documents filed on behalf of the 1st Party-Management support their case.

8 The dispute has been raised at the instance of the 2nd party. But he did not take part in the proceeding when the witness of the 1st Party-Management was examined and argument was heard, inspite of opportunities given to him by this Tribunal by sending notices. The evidence produced on behalf of the 2nd Party is not sufficient to accept his grievance. So, this Tribunal is of the opinion that the 2nd party has failed to make out a case by producing any compelling materials to record a finding that the action taken by the 1st Party-Management in terminating the services of the 2nd Party is illegal and unjustified.

### ISSUE NO. II

9. In view of my findings given in respect of Issue No. 1 and 2nd party-Workman is not entitled for any relief.

10 Reference is answered accordingly.

Dictated and Corrected by me.

S.K. DHAL, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 21 जून, 2002

का. आ. 2371.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार ई. सी. एल. प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, आसनसोल पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 113/1999) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 20-6-2002 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-22012/25/99-आई.आर. (सी-II)]

एन. पी. केशवन, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 21st June, 2002

S. O. 2371.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 113/1999) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal - cum-Labour Court, Asansol as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of ECL and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 20-6-2002.

[No. L-22012/25/99-IR (C-II)]

N. P. KESAVAN, Desk Officer

### ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL  
TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, ASANSOL

PRESENT:

Shri Ramjee Pandey  
Presiding Officer.

### REFERENCE NO. 113 OF 1999

PARTIES:

Satgram Project of Satgram Area,  
M/s. E. C. Ltd.

Management.

Vrs.

Sh. Brij Kishore Singh

Workman.

REPRESENTATION:

For the Management

None

For the workman (Union)

Shri S. K. Pandey,  
Chief General Secretary,  
Koyla Mazdoor Congress.

Industry :

Coal

State :

West Bengal.

Dated 16-05-2002

### AWARD

In exercise of powers conferred by Clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2(A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, Govt. of India through

Ministry of Labour vide Order No.L-22012/25/99-IR (CM-II), dated 30-07-1999 has referred the following dispute for adjudication by this Tribunal.

“Whether the action of the management of Satgram Project of Satgram Area of M/s. ECL in not regularising Sh. Brij Kishore Singh, General Mazdoor as Magazine Clerk w.e.f. Nov., 1994 is legal and justified? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?”

After receiving the reference summons were sent to the parties by registered post. Although none appeared on behalf of the management but Shri S. K. Pandey, Chief General Secretary of Koyla Mazdoor Congress appeared on behalf of the workman and filed a petition stating therein that the workman has changed his cadre and now he is not interested to contest the dispute and made a prayer therein to pass a 'No Dispute Award'. Shri S. K. Pandey personally made submission that the workman is not going to contest the dispute.

Since the workman is not interested to contest the dispute, let a 'No Dispute Award' be passed.

RAMJEE PANDEY, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 24 जून, 2002

का.आ. 2372.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण कम लेबर कोर्ट, चंडीगढ़ के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या आई. डी. नं.-191/89) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 21-06-2002 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/220/89-आई.आर.(बी.-I)]

अजय कुमार, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 24th June, 2002

S.O. 2372.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. I.D-191/89) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-Cum-Labour Court, Chandigarh as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of State Bank of Patiala and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 21-06-2002.

[No. L-12012/220/89-IR(B-I)]

AJAY KUMAR, Desk Officer

## ANNEXURE

BEFORE SHRI S. M. GOEL, PRESIDING OFFICER,  
CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-  
LABOUR COURT, CHANDIGARH

CASE NO. I.D. 191/89

General Secretary,  
State Bank of Patiala  
Staff Union (Punjab) 2189  
Sector 22-C-Chandigarh.

... Applicant

## Versus

General Manager,  
State Bank of Patiala,  
Head Office,  
Mall Road, Patiala

... Respondent

## Appearances

For the Workman Shri J. G. Verma

For the Management : Shri N. K. Zakhmi

## AWARD

(Passed on 12th June, 2002)

The Central Govt. vide notification No. L-12012/220/89-IR (B-3) dated 7th of November 1989 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :

“Whether the management of State Bank of Patiala in relation to their Safidon Branch in dismissing Shri T. R. Jain, Cashier, w.e.f. 10-2-1988 is just, fair and legal, If not, what relief the workman concerned is entitled to.”

2. In the claim statement the applicant has pleaded that while working in the Safidon Branch of the Bank he was involved in false case of revalidating a cheque for Rs. 210.50 and got the amount of said cheque. He was charge sheeted on this account by the Branch Manager. He was falsely implicated by the Branch Manager to save his own skin. The Manager in connivance with the other officials stated that in case the applicant admits the charges the matter would be settled and hence under pressure the workman admitted the charge before the start of the enquiry and denied the allegations during the enquiry. The findings of the enquiry officer are based on the surmises and conjecture as no charge was proved against the workman. The complainant was not produced during the enquiry but nephew of the complainant was produced who identified the signatures of his uncle on the withdrawal form produced by the management during the enquiry. It is pleaded that the enquiry conducted by the management is illegal and punishing authority did not apply its mind while passing the dismissal order and appellate authority also dismissed the appeal without appreciating the evidence on record. It

is also pleaded that punishment is excessive and disproportionate to the charges levelled against the workman. It is prayed that the workman be reinstated with continuity of service with full back wages and other consequential benefits

3. In written statement the stand of the management is that applicant is guilty of serious acts of misconduct. The applicant withdraw the amount from the account of Shri Sadique. The workman was charge sheeted but the applicant did not reply to the charge sheet instead of he submitted a letter dated 24-1-1987 stating that he had nothing to say in the matter except already clarified vide letter dated 2-8-1986. Domestic enquiry was conducted against the workman and he was given full opportunity to prove his innocence. The enquiry officer found him guilty of the charges and his services were dismissed by the punishing authority. Thus the action of the management is legal and in accordance with the rules and regulations applicable to the bank employees. The appeal was also dismissed by the appellate authority after applying its mind. Thus it is prayed on behalf of the management that there is no merit in the reference and same be dismissed

4. Replication was also filed on behalf of the applicant reiterating the claim made in the claim statement.

5. In evidence the applicant filed his own affidavit as Ex. W1. He also admitted enquiry filed Ex. M1 containing pages 1 to 79. In rebuttal the management filed the affidavit of Shri D. N. Garg as Ex-M2 in evidence. He was also cross-examined by the rep. of the workman.

6. I have heard the learned counsels for the parties and have gone through the evidence and record of the case. In all fairness to the counsel for the applicant, he has not contested the case about the fairness of the enquiry. He has only argued that the punishment imposed by the management on the workman is excessive as the amount involved was of Rs. 210 50 and punishment of dismissal is disproportionate to the offence committed by the workman. For his arguments he has relied on Assistant General Manager S.B.I. Vs. Thomas Jose and another reported in (2000) 10 Supreme Court cases 280 and argued that in that case the Hon'ble Supreme Court has appropriate order should at least have been of reinstatement without backwages plus a direction that the applicant would not be entitled to any increments for a substantial period for 10 years. Thus the counsel for the applicant has argued that the applicant may also be reinstated and his increments may be stopped as was directed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the above mentioned case. That case was similar to the case in hand and the punishment may be substituted. On the other hand the counsel for the management has relied on the latest authority of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of UCO Bank, Chandigarh and ors. Versus Hardev Singh decided by the Hon'ble Supreme Court on 18-2-2002

in Civil Appeal No. 1377 of 2002. It was held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the above noted case that it is case of misplaced sympathy and one expects the higher standard of honesty and integrity when admittedly small amounts deposited by the bank's customers do not find their way into the coffers of the bank but land up in the pocket of an employee to say that the charge is not serious or the embezzlement is not intentional would be gross understatement. Thus relying of the latest judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court I am of the opinion that the workman admitted his charges and he committed a serious act of misconduct. He deserves no sympathy. I further hold that enquiry is proper and in accordance with the principle of natural justice.

7. In view of the discussions made in the earlier paras, the action of the management in dismissing T. R. Jain cashier w.e.f. 10-2-1988 is just, fair and legal and the workman is not entitled to any relief. The reference is answered accordingly. Central Govt be informed.

S. M. GOEL, Presiding Officer

Chandigarh

Dated 12-6-2002

नई दिल्ली, 24 जून, 2002

का. आ. 2373.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार स्टेट बैंक ऑफ पटियाला के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण-कम-लेबर कोर्ट, चंडीगढ़ के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या आई० डी. नं.-267/98) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 21-06-2002 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/81/98-आई.आर.(बी.-1)]

अजय कुमार, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 24th June, 2002

S. O. 2373.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. I.D 267/98) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Chandigarh as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of State Bank of Patiala and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 21-06-2002.

[No. L-12012/81/98-IR(B-I)]

AJAY KUMAR, Desk Officer

## ANNEXURE.

BEFORE SHRI S. M. GOEL, PRESIDING OFFICER,  
CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-  
LABOUR COURT, CHANDIGARH

CASE NO. ID 267/98

Smt. Ravinder Kaur Dhody  
C/o Shri Tek Chand Sharma.  
25, Sant Nagar, Civil Lines,  
Ludhiana-141001

Applicant

Versus

The General Manager (OP),  
State Bank of Patiala,  
Head Office,  
The Mall, Patiala-147001

....Respondent

## Representatives

For the Workman : None

For the Management : Shri N. K. Zakham

## AWARD

Dated on 29th May, 2002

The Central Govt. Ministry of Labour vide Notification No. L-12012/81/98-IR (B-1) dated 13th November 1998 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :

"Whether the action of the management of State Bank of Patiala represented by the General Manager, S. B. of Patiala, in treating Smt. Ravinder Kaur Dhody as voluntarily retired w.e.f. 5-5-93 as per clause 17(a) of the 5th bipartite settlement is fair and just. If not to what relief to the workman entitled to?"

2. None appeared on behalf of the workman. It appears that workman is not interested to pursue with the present reference. In view of the above, the present reference is returned to the Central Govt. for want of prosecution. Central Govt. be informed.

S. M. GOEL, Presiding Officer

Chandigarh

नई दिल्ली, 27 जून, 2002

का. आ. 2374.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार लक्ष्मी विलास बैंक लिमिटेड के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण-कम-लेबर कोर्ट, बंगलौर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या सी. आर.-30/2000) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 26-06-2002 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[ सं. एल-12012/106/2000-आई.आर.(बी.-I) ]

अजय कुमार, डैस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 27th June, 2002

S.O. 2374.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. C.R. 30/2000) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Bangalore now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of The Lakshmi Vilas Bank Ltd. and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 26-06-2002.

[No. L-12012/106/2000-IR(B-I)]

AJAY KUMAR, Desk Officer

## ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL  
TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, BANGALORE

Dated 19th June 2002

PRESENT

Hon'ble Shri V. N. Kulkarni, B. Com. LLB.

PRESIDING OFFICER

CGIT-CUM-LABOUR COURT,

BANGALORE.

C. R. NO. 30/2000

I PARTY :

Shri S. Narasinga Rao,  
C/o S. Nagu Bai,  
D No 57,  
Ward No. 13,  
Marata Street,  
Canning Road,  
Bellary P. O.

II PARTY

The Branch Manager,  
The Lakshmi Vilas Bank Ltd.,  
Bellary.

## AWARD

1 The Central Govt. by exercising the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section 2A of the Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 has referred this dispute vide order No. L-12012/106/2000-IR (B-1) dated 24th May, 2000 for adjudication on the following Schedule :

## THE SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of M/s. The Lakshmi Vilas Bank Ltd., Karur is justified in terminating the services of workman Shri S. Narasinga Rao w.e.f. 1-10-1999 orally? If not to what relief the workman is entitled to?"

2. The first party workman was working with the Second Party management. He was terminated from service and therefore, Industrial dispute is raised.

3. When the reference was received notices were sent to the parties. It is seen from the records that first party remained absent throughout. Number of adjournments were given. It appears that the first party is not interested in going on this dispute.

4. No purpose will be served if the matter is kept pending. Therefore I proceed to pass the following order.

### ORDER

The reference is rejected.

(Dictated to PA transcribed by her corrected and signed by me on 19th June, 2002)

V. N. KULKARNI, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 27 जून, 2002

का. आ. 2375.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार कर्नाटक बैंक लिमिटेड के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण-कम-लेबर कोर्ट बंगलूर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या सी. आर. 96/99) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 26-6-2002 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/12/99—आई.आर. (बी-1)]

अजय कुमार, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 27th June, 2002

S. O. 2375.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes, Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. C.R. 96/99) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court Bangalore now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of The Karnataka Bank Ltd. and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 26-6-2002

[No. L-12012/12/99-IR (B-D)]

AJAY KUMAR, Desk Officer

### ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL  
TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, BANGALORE

Dated 18th June, 2002

PRESENT

HON'BLE SHRI V. N. KULKARNI, B. COM, LLB,  
PRESIDING OFFICER  
CGIT-CUM-LABOUR COURT,  
BANGALORE

C.R. NO. 96/99

### I PARTY

Shri C.K. Wajapey,  
S/o S.V. Kulkarni,  
Chaitanya,  
Bharathi Nagar,  
DHARWAD

### II PARTY

The Dy. General Manager (HR & IR)  
The Karnataka Bank Ltd,  
Regd. and Head Office,  
P.B.No. 716,  
Kodiallbail,  
BANGALORE-575003  
(KARNATAKA)

### AWARD

1. The Central Government by exercising the powers conferred by clause (d) of Sub-section 2A of the Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 has referred this dispute vide order No. L-12012/12/99/IR(B-1) dated 4th August, 1999 for adjudication on the following Schedule :

### SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of M/s. Karnataka Bank Ltd., is justified in imposing the punishment of dismissal from service on Sri C.K. Wajapey. If not, to what relief the workman is entitled to?"

2. The first party was working with the Second Party management. He was dismissed from service and therefore, Industrial Dispute is raised.

3. Parties appeared and filed Claim Statement and Counter respectively.

4. The case of the workman in brief is as follows .

5. It is the case of the workman that he was appointed as a Clerk on 22nd October, 1977 at Hubli Branch.

6. It is his further case that because of some financial problems he withdrew some money unauthorisedly and he admitted his mistake and remitted back the amount of Rs. 25,000. Even after this the management has given charge sheet and enquiry is conducted. He was transferred to Gulbarga. The management illegally dismissed him before the misconduct was detected. It was a bonafide mistake.

7. Regarding enquiry it is said that the charge sheet is belated and was processed only when the Claimant disclosed the act and remitted the money with interest. The Bank had not undergone any financial loss. The action of the management is not correct. Workman has prayed to pass award in his favour.

8. Against this the case of the management in brief is as follows :—

9. During October, 1977 the workman was working at Hubli. Investigation was conducted against the first party in respect of misappropriation of Rs. 25,000/- and the first party admitted the misappropriation and remitted the

amount of Rs. 25,000/-. The enquiry was conducted properly and after the enquiry some minor punishment was ordered as stated in para 3 of the Counter. It is not true to say that the claimant himself went to the Manager and informed him about another irregularity which the first party had committed in 1994 by which he had withdrawn Rs. 20,000/- illegally. This misappropriation of Rs. 20,000/- had come to the notice of the 2nd party Bank on 16-1-1996 while tallying the dormant Saving Bank accounts at Dharwad Main Branch. Again investigation was ordered and the first party was issued with a charge sheet for the misappropriation of Rs. 20,000/- and enquiry was conducted.

10. Regarding enquiry it is said that the procedure was followed correctly in the first hearing date. Management examined the witnesses but the first party has not cross examined the witnesses even after giving an opportunity. First party has not adduced any evidence. He filed written Arguments. The allegations made by the workman are not correct. The report of the Enquiry Officer is correct. The misconduct committed by the first party is grave and the action of the management is correct. There is no victimization or mala fide intention. The first party deserves no sympathy for the misconduct he has committed. The management for these reasons and for some other reasons has prayed to reject the reference.

11. It is seen from the records that the management examined one witness Shri B.H. Ramprasad who conducted the enquiry and gave detailed evidence. He is cross examined.

12. Against this the workman got examined himself as WW1. This Tribunal by its order dated 3rd May, 2002 passed orders holding that the Domestic Enquiry is Fair and Proper. Thereafter the case is posted for arguments.

13. I have heard the learned counsels appearing the parties. I have carefully perused the enquiry proceedings. I have considered the entire material produced before the Enquiry Officer. I have read the evidence adduced before the Enquiry Officer by the management on the misconduct. On careful examination of the entire enquiry proceedings and the records, it is clear that very systematically enquiry is conducted. The report of the Enquiry Officer shows that he has considered the entire evidence and documents and gave his report.

14. Now that the enquiry is held as fair and proper and the fact that the Enquiry Officer has considered the entire material and gave finding is sufficient to say that the misconduct is proved, unless, the workman establishes that the finding of the Enquiry Officer is perverse.

15. In the instant case nothing is made out by the workman so as to say that the finding of the Enquiry Officer is perverse.

16. According to the case of the management as seen from the Counter, the workman has committed misconduct

by misappropriating a sum of Rs. 25,000/- and as said by the management, minor punishment was imposed and he was transferred to Gulbarga. In other words this is the second time the workman being an official of a nationalized bank has misappropriated a sum of Rs. 20,000/- .

17. Apart from this I have already said that the Enquiry Officer has properly appreciated the evidence and documents and has come to the right conclusion and that his findings are sound and the workman has failed to establish as to how the finding of the Enquiry Officer is perverse..

18. I have read the following two decisions relied by the workman:

- (1) AIR 1989 Supreme Court 149;
- (2) AIR 1989 Supreme Court 151.

19. I have carefully read the above decisions. In order to take the benefit of these two decisions the workman on facts has to prove that the finding of the Enquiry Officer is perverse and there is no misappropriation by the workman. The facts of the case on hand are quite different from the facts of the above two decisions.

20. There are no good grounds in the instant case to invoke the provisions of Section 11A of the Industrial Dispute, Act.

21. The learned counsel appearing for the management has relied the following decisions:

- (1) 2002 (1) LLJ 234 SC (3 Judges)
- (2) AIR 2001 SC 930
- (3) 2000 (11) LLJ 1395 DV
- (4) 1998 (4) SC 310
- (5) 1997 FJR (Vol. 90) SC Page 1
- (6) AIR 1997 SC 2661
- (7) 1996 FJR (Vol. 49) SC Page 49
- (8) 1989 (2) JT SC 132
- (9) 2001 AIR Kant, H.C.R. 2076(DB)
- (10) 2001 AIR-Kant H.C.R. 1269(DB)
- (11) ILR 2001 KAR 2650 (DB)
- (12) 1997 FJR (Vol.91) Kar 605 (DB)
- (13) 1995 (1) LLJ Kar 1076(DB)
- (14) 1991 FJR (Vol.79) Kar. H.C. Page 477
- (15) 1999 FJR (Vol.95) Kar Page 864(DB)
- (16) 1998 FJR (Vol.92) Mad H.C. Page 62(DB)
- (17) 1987 LAB 1C Cal. H.C. Page 77(DB)
- (18) 1996 Lab 1C 1056 SC
- (19) JT 1998 (9) SC 37

22. I have read all the above decisions carefully. According to the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India misplaced sympathy to Order reinstate is not correct

23. Keeping in mind the principles held in the decisions relied by the learned counsel for the management and looking to the facts of the case I am of the opinion that in the instant case misconduct is proved and it is not established that the finding of the Enquiry Officer is perverse and therefore, there are no good grounds to invoke the provisions of Section 11A of the Industrial Disputes Act and to interfere with the punishment imposed by the management.

24. I have already said that for the second time the first party workman has misappropriated the bank money. The fact that it is remitted back will not help the workman at all.

25. I have given my best consideration to the material before me and I am of the opinion that there is no case to interfere with the punishment imposed by the management. Accordingly I proceed to pass the following order:

### ORDER

The Reference is rejected.

(Dictated to P.A. transcribed by her, corrected and signed by me on 18 June 2002.)

V. N. KULKARNI, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 27 जून, 2002

का. आ. 2376.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार साऊथ सेन्ट्रल रेलवे के प्रबंधन के संबंधित नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण-कम-लेबर कोर्ट, बंगलौर के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या सी. आर. 2/94) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 26-6-2002 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-41012/119/92-आई.आर. (बी-1)]

अजय कुमार, डेस्क अधिकारी

New Delhi, the 27th June, 2002

S.O. 2376.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. C.R. 2/94) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, Bangalore now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of South Central Railway and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 26-6-2002.

[No. L-41012/119/92-IR (B-I)]

AJAY KUMAR, Desk Officer

### ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, BANGALORE

Dated the 11th June, 2002

PRESENT

HON'BLE SHRI V. N. KULKARNI, B. COM. LL.B.,  
PRESIDING OFFICER

CGIT-CUM-LABOUR COURT,  
BANGALORE

C R. No. 2/94

I PARTY

II PARTY

Shri A. H. Ambali, C/o I. H. Belgaumwala, Bhusappa Chowk, Mydar One, Dharwar	The Divisional Railway Manager, South Central Railway, Hubli - 580020
--	---

### AWARD

1. The Central Government by exercising the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (2A) of the Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 has referred this dispute vide Order No. L-41012/119/92/IR(DU) dated 10th January, 1994 for adjudication on the following schedule

### SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of South Central Railway, Hubli in removing the service of Shri A.H. Ambali is proper, legal and justified? If not to what relief the concerned workman is entitled to?"

2. The first party workman was working with the Second Party management. He was terminated from service and therefore, Industrial dispute is raised.

3. When the reference was received notices were sent to parties and parties appeared and filed Claim Statement and Counters respectively.

4. The case of the workman in brief is as follows. -

5. It is the case of the workman that he was appointed as Khalasi on 1-12-1986 and he was posted to work at Hubli. He was working as Watchman. He requested for change of duties due to the demise of his father but that was not considered. Charge sheet was issued and enquiry was conducted and on the basis of enquiry he was terminated. Charges are not proved. First party for these reasons and for some other reasons has prayed to pass award in his favour.



6 The case of the Second Party in brief is as follows:—

7. The case of the management is that the charge sheet was issued for major penalty because he was unauthorisedly absent from duties for number of days as stated in Written Statement/Objection. He was terminated as per the service condition rules. The claim is not proper. The management has prayed to reject the reference.

8. It is seen from the records that a domestic enquiry was held. This is a case of 1994. We are in the middle of 2002. Even after giving number of adjournments the management has not bothered to adduce evidence on domestic enquiry. Thereafter the case was posted for evidence of workman on domestic enquiry. After that both parties neither represented the case nor adduced any evidence. It appears that both the parties are not interested in this case. No purpose will be served if the matter is kept pending.

9 Taking all this into consideration I proceed to pass the following Order :

### ORDER

The reference is rejected

(Dictated to P. A. transcribed by her corrected and signed by me on 11th June 2002)

V. N. KULKARNI, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 24 जून, 2002

**का. आ. 2377.**—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार यूको बैंक के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय चंडीगढ़ के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 128/93) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 21-6-2002 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[ सं. एल-12012/127/93-आई.आर. (बी-II) ]

सी० गंगाधरण, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 24th June, 2002

**S.O. 2377.**—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref No 128/93) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court Chandigarh as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of UCO Bank and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 21-06-2002.

[No L-12012/127/93-IR (B-II)]

C. GANGADHARAN, Under Secy.

### ANNEXURE

BEFORE SHRI S.M. GOEL, PRESIDING OFFICER  
CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-  
LABOUR COURT, CHANDIGARH.

Case No. ID 128/93

General Secretary, UCO Bank Employees Union C/o UCO  
Bank G. T. Road, Jalandhar.

Applicant

### Versus

Divisional Manager, UCO Bank, 51 Mahavir Marg, Near  
B. M. C. Chowk, Jalandhar.

Respondent

### Appearances

For the workman : Shri T. C. Sharma

For the management : Shri D. R. Sharma

### AWARD

(Passed on 12th of June 2002)

The Central Government vide notification No. L-12012/127/93-IR B II dated 4th of October 1993 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication:—

"Whether the action of the management of UCO Bank in terminating the services of Shri Hans Raj is justified? If not, what relief is the workman entitled to?"

2. The applicant Hans Raj filed the claim statement inter alia pleading that he was appointed in the respondent bank after qualifying written test and interview as peon-cum-watchman against permanent post for a period of six months probation on 25-9-1989 but his services were terminated by the branch manager on 7-12-1989 without assigning any reason. No enquiry was conducted against the applicant and no show cause notice was issued. He was issued only a letter dated 4-12-1989 regarding his misconduct. The management also violated the provisions of Section 25-G of the I.D. Act as last come first go formula was not adopted by the bank. The management also violated the provisions of Section 25-H of the I.D. Act as fresh hands were appointed after his illegal termination. No regular enquiry was held against the applicant and his services were terminated by the management without following the proper procedure. He thus prayed that he be reinstated in service with full back wages.

3. In the written statement the plea was taken by the management that the applicant was a probationer and he was discharged from the service as per terms and conditions of his appointment as he was not confirmed in the bank's services. Section 25-G and H are not applicable to the case of the applicant and he was discharged from the services by simplicitor order which does not cause any stigma on

the applicant and no regular enquiry was required to be held. As the work and conduct of the applicant was not satisfactory so his services were dispensed with during the probation period as per the condition No. 4 of the appointment letter. The management, therefore, prayed for the rejection of the reference.

4. Replication was also filed by the applicant reiterating the claim made in the claim statement.

5. In evidence, the applicant filed his affidavit as Ex. W1 and he also filed the documents Ex. W1 to W8. He has admitted in cross-examination that his services were terminated as per clause IV of appointment letter. In rebuttal the management filed the affidavit of Jagtar Singh as Ex. M1/A, He has also relied on the documents Ex. M1 to Ex. M3.

6. I have heard the representatives of the parties and have gone through the evidence and record of the case. It is admitted case of the parties that the applicant was appointed on 25-9-1989 and his services were terminated on 7-12-1989. It is also admitted case of the parties that no enquiry was conducted against the workman before terminating his services. It is also not disputed that applicant was on probation for six months and he was not confirmed in the service of the bank. In this case the stand of the management is that the services of the applicant were dispensed with as per the clause IV of his appointment letter. Ex. W1 is the appointment letter. It is clearly stipulated in clause IV of this appointment letter that his services are liable to be terminated in the sole discretion of the bank even before the expiry of the probation period without assigning any reason but with one month's notice or on payment of a month's pay and allowance in lieu of notice on either side. I have also examined Ex. W2 termination letter dated 7-12-1989 along with this letter three documents have been attached by the bank. One is the letter dated 6-12-1989 and two other documents were the cheques for Rs. 196-35 and Rs. 1219-47 on account of one month's pay also allowance as per the terms of the appointment letter. So the services of the workman were terminated under clause IV of the appointment letter and I find no ambiguity in this termination and this termination can not be said as stigma termination. I further hold that there is no violation of section 25-G and H of the I. D. Act 1947 in such type of termination. The management exercised its discretion in terminating the services of the applicant under clause IV of the appointment letter. Thus in my considered opinion, the applicant is not entitled to any relief. Consequently, there is no merit in the reference and the same is returned against the workman. Reference is answered accordingly. Central Govt. be informed.

S. M. GOEL, Presiding Officer

Chandigarh,  
12-6-2002

नई दिल्ली, 24 जून, 2002

का. आ. 2378.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार भारतीय जीवन बीमा निगम के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/श्रम न्यायालय लखनऊ के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 41/2002) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 21-6-2002 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-17011/58/89-आई.आर. (बी-II)]

सी. गंगाधरण, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 24th June, 2002

S.O. 2378.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 41/2002) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court Lucknow as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Life Insurance Corporation of India and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 21-6-2002.

[No. L-17011/58/89-IR (B-II)]

C. GANGADHARAN, Under Secy.

#### ANNEXURE

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-  
CUM-LABOUR COURT, LUCKNOW

#### PRESENT

Rudresh Kumar, Presiding Officer

I.D. NO. 41/2002 (DELHI No. 22/90)

Ref. No. L-17011/58/89-IR(B-II) dated 08-2-90

#### BETWEEN

Vinod Kumar Rajput C/o Sri Tularam,  
395, Subhash Nagar, Gali No. 8,  
Meerut-250001 (U.P.)

#### AND

The Divisional Manager, LIC of India, Jeevan Prakash,  
Prabhat Nagar, Meerut-250001 (U.P.)

#### AWARD

By order No. L-17011/58/89-IR(B-II) dated 08-02-90, the Central Government in the Ministry of Labour, in exercise of powers conferred by clause (d) of Sub-section (1) and Sub-section 2 (A) of Section 10 Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) referred this industrial dispute between Vinod Kumar Rajput C/o Sri Tularam, 395, Subhash Nagar, Gali No. 8, Meerut (U.P.) and the Divisional Manager, LIC of India, Jeevan Prakash, Prabhat Nagar, Meerut (U.P.)

for adjudication to CGIT-cum-Labour Court, New Delhi. By corrigendum dated 7/11-02-2002 the Under Secretary, Government of India, Ministry of Labour amended the reference by substituting the word 'Termination' by 'Dismissal'. Later, the Central Government transferred this I.D. to CGIT-cum-Labour Court, Lucknow vide order No Z-20025/54/2001-CLS-II dated 19-04-2002. The amended reference reads as follow :—

"Whether the action of the management of L.I.C of India in ordering dismissal of Sri Vinod Kumar Rajput, Cashier from service vide order dated 21-09-87 is justified? If not, to what relief the workman concerned is entitled?"

2. The workman, Vinod Kumar Rajput was admittedly, a Cashier, working at LIC branch, Bijnor on 14-02-83. He appointed as an Assistant in the Establishment of the opposite party on 1-11-1974. While functioning as cashier in the LIC branch at Bijnor, on 24-02-83 he left the office at 3 P.M. to take lunch. He was due to return from lunch at 3.45 P.M. However, he did not return and resumed his duties after lunch recess but remained unauthorisedly absent from seat from 3.45 P.M. to 5.15 P.M. He return at about 5.15 P.M. After office hours (5.00 P.M.) in drunken state. As a cashier, it was his duty to close the Branch premium etc., Cash Book, Daily cash balance book for the day before the close of office. Because of his absence at post lunch hours and also appearing in drunken state, he failed to discharge his duties. Further, he abused abusive, language against Asstt. Branch Manager (Admn.) and Sr. Branch Manager and threatened them to dire consequences. During the course of such disorderly behaviour he went berserk and broke the table glass and damaged the telephone of the office of Sr. Branch Manager and also office table lamp. He tried to tear the Cash Book and threatened that he would not allow the Bijnore branch office to open on 25-02-83. This incident was reported by the Mr. R.C. Sharma, Asstt. Branch Manager, to the police on the same day seeking protection at the time of reopening of the office on the next date i.e. 25-02-83 at 9.00 A.M. Since daily work of 24-02-83 remained incomplete, all the registers etc., viz: Branch premium etc., Cash Book, Daily Cash Balance Book were kept in the same condition in safe custody.

3. The conduct of the workman was violative of Clauses 21, 24, 30(1) and 39(1) of the Life Insurance Corporation of India (Staff) Regulations, 1960 for which any more of the penalties mentioned in Clause 39(1) (1) to (g) could be imposed after due enquiry, after affording opportunity to the workman.

4. A charge sheet was issued to the workman on 30-07-83. The charges read as under :

- (i) That on 24-02-83 you left the office at 3.00 P.M. to avail lunch interval and after availing the same,

you were due to return to your duty at 3.45 P.M. You, however, did not return to the office and thus remained unauthorisedly absent from 3.45 P.M. to 5.0 P.M.

- (ii) Since you were working on the Cash counter of the Branch Office on 24-02-1983 it was also your duty to close the Branch premium etc., Cash Book (Form No. 4705) and Daily Cash Balance Book (Form No. 4719) for the day before the close of the office hours. You did not close both the aforesaid books on 24-02-1983 and thus neglected your duties; and
- (iii) That on 24-02-83 you returned to the Branch at 5.15 P.M. in a drunken state, used abusive language against the Asstt. Branch Manager (Admn.) threatened the Asstt. Branch Manager (Admn.) and the Sr. Branch manager (who was not present in the Office) with dire consequences. During the course you also turned violent, broke the table glass of the Sr. Branch Manager, damaged the Sr. Branch Manager office telephone and the Office table lamp and tried to tear off the Cash Book. You also threatened that you will not allow as the Branch to be opened on 25-02-1983.

"That in your aforesaid acts you have failed to maintain absolute integrity and devotion to duty and have acted in a manner prejudicial to good conduct and detrimental to the interest of the Corporation thereby violating the provisions of Regulation 21, 24, 30(1) of LIC of India (Staff) Regulations, 1960 can be imposed upon you."

5. In reply to the above charge sheet, on 3-10-83 the workman made bald denial stating that he did not accept the charges framed in the charge sheet dated 30-07-83. This reply was found unsatisfactory and the Sr. Divisional Manager appointed Mr. A. K. Jain. A. A.O. (L & M). Divisional Office, Meerut, as Enquiry Officer. On transfer of Mr. A. K. Jain, another Enquiry Officer Mr. S. K. Sakhuja, Manager (Accounts) Divisional Office, Meerut was appointed vide D.M.'s order Ref : P & IR date 11-07-86.

Mr. S. K. Sakhuja conduct enquiry. The workman participated in the enquiry duly assisted by Mr. B. K. Sharma. He elaborately cross examined management's witnesses. Management relied on copy of reports to Police dated 24-02-83 filed by Asstt. Branch Manager, Manager, R. C. Sharma. Relevant documents left in complete as well evidence showing broken glasses, office telephone etc. were also produced. Letter reference Accounts 259 dated 25-02-83 from Bijnore Branch written to Divisional Officer, Meerut regarding DCB of 24-02-83 duly signed by Mr. R. C. Sharma. Asstt. Branch Manager (Admn.) (Holder of

safe key No. 1) and Mr. Kamal Singh. HGA (Holder of safe key No. 2) was also produced. Management also relied on the statements of Mr. R. C. Sharma, Asstt. Branch Manager (Admn.) Mr. B. C. Aggarwal Sr. Branch Manager, Bijnore Branch and Mr. Kamal Singh, HGA of cash department of Bijnore Branch Office. As desired by the workman, ten other documents were produced by the Presenting Officer. The workman also examined Mr. Deepak Kumar in his defence and also produced documents. This is evident that the workman had due notice of enquiry and he participated with his Defence Assistants and also availed full opportunity by cross examining the management's witnesses and also by adducing his own witness. The Enquiry Officer returned the verdict that charges were fully proved. The Disciplinary Authority thereafter issued notice to the workman proposing punishment of dismissal and considering his reply dismissed him. His appeal was also rejected. The second show cause notice mentioned proved past misconducts of the workman which were taken into consideration at the time of passing penalty of dismissal.

6. Two issues were fixed in this tribunal by order dated 26-02-91:

- (i) Whether the domestic enquiry conducted against the workman is fair and proper ?; and
- (ii) As in terms of reference ?

7. For purposes of deciding fairness of the enquiry, relevant materials on record of the enquiry proceeding have to be evaluated. The management submitted enquiry file and copies furnished to the workman. Thus, no controversy is raised on this fact. While judging the fairness of the enquiry, it is, also, necessary to assess whether the findings of the Enquiry Officer suffer with the vice of perversity?

8. As regards procedures adopted by the Enquiry Officer, no grievance is raised that there was failure on the part of the Enquiry Officer to deny opportunity to cross examine management's witnesses and also opportunity to adduce evidence in defence. All the three witnesses examined by the management were thoroughly cross examined by the workman assisted by his Defence Assistant. The Enquiry Officer acted independently and there is no material to substantiate that he was biased or his approach caused prejudice to the workman in any manner. So, it can not be said that there was any procedural deficiency or denial of opportunity to the workman during the course of the domestic enquiry. It has been observed earlier that the Enquiry Officer was not biased or acted as tool of the management and so, the enquiry is held fair and proper.

9. Let it be discussed whether the findings of Enquiry Officer suffer with vice of perversity?. As regard charge No. 1 there is no controversy that the workman was present in the office in pre-lunch period on 24-02-83 i.e. up to 3.00 P.M. Also there is no controversy that he left his seat for lunch.

The work of the day could not have been completed in pre-lunch period and as per work culture, the records are normally completed after public working hours, generally in post lunch period. There is no dispute that record pertaining to financial matters were be completed by the closing hours.

10. Let it be scrutinised whether the adverse findings of the Enquiry Officer against the workman, is reasonable, in consonance with the evidence on record, or the findings are perverse. MW 1 Mr. R. C. Sharma and MW2 Kamal Singh were present in the office on the fateful day i.e. 24-02-83. There is no material to support inference that they entertained any malafide intention against the workman to involve him falsely. In pre-lunch period their relations were cordial and also the office working was peaceful. The dispute erupted only the post lunch period, say, after the closing hours i.e. 5.15 P.M. as observed earlier, DCB and other financial records were not ready before lunch period. It was the duty of Cashier, the workman, to have completed the work before 5 P. M. It is alleged that the workman arrived at 5.15 P.M. i.e. after closing hours. On the said date i.e. 24-02-83 work could not be completed and the records were kept in safe custody. These were completed in the succeeding morning. The letter dated 25-02-83, jointly signed by Mr. R. C. Sharma and Kamal Singh states that the records were completed next morning i.e. on 25-02-83. The cash was counted and DCB was completed. The cash and cash chest were also found correct. Banking was also done correctly. The DCB of 24-02-83 was completed by the cashier in the morning of 25-02-83 instead of 24-02-83 evening. In his cross examination and submissions much emphasis was made that DCB and other records bear 24-02-83 and not 25-02-83, so, it is clear that the Cashier completed the work on 24-02-83 itself and not on 25-02-83 as alleged. This submission is not supported by evidence. Since these records related to 24-02-83 and so were signed in the same date. Pre dating of the records showing completion 24-02-83, can not be said to be unusual. The signature of the workman on 25-02-83 giving 24-02-83 does not give entrance that the records were completed on 24-02-83 itself. Had it been so, there was no occasion to write a letter to Divisional Manager, Meerut on 25-02-83 jointly signed by Asstt. Branch Manager (A) and HGA (Acctt.) who were the holders of safe key No. 1 & 2, respectively. They had no motive to prepare false letter. There was no occasion for Mr. R. C. Sharma to lodge a report with police narrating the facts and seeking police protection on 25-02-83. This report was primarily made to secure police protection on the succeeding day. Sr. Branch Manager was not available on the said day. No doubt, police report was lodged at 11.45 P.M., but the report was aimed primarily to ensure smooth working on the next day. This delayed reported was not unjustified as the Asstt. Branch Manager, Mr. R. C. Sharma was not supposed to act in haste. In any event, there is no

material to support submission of the workman that the report to the police was made falsely.

11 According to the management the workman had arrived in the office after closing hours. He was in drunken state, and conducted himself in disorderly way and caused damage to properties of the office being in intoxicated state. These charges can not be said to be manipulations. The workman during the enquiry revealed that he had developed headache and trouble in his eyes and so went to doctor. If this fact be taken on its face value, he admitted to be not present in the office, in the post lunch period and further did not complete the records of the day. Mr. R. C. Sharma as Asstt. Branch Manager (A) was under his right to protest on such behaviour of the workman. The Enquiry Officer has elaborately discussed and analysed circumstances to hold that on 24-02-83 at about 5.15 P. M. the workman behaved in violent and disorderly manner and also threatened to officers. This fact is supported by the circumstances also. The findings of the Enquiry Officer are based on good reasons and are not perverse. He rightly found the charges proved.

12. The Disciplinary Authority issued second show cause notice to the workman proposing punishment and sought reply from him. In the said show cause notice, same of his previous misconducts were also mentioned for seeking comment. In para 11 of the written statement, this fact is categorically stated and there appears no denial of the previous misconduct.

13. The workman was a cashier and worked diligently upto 3.00 P.M. Also on scrutiny of papers on 25-02-83, all the items including cash etc. were found correct and these facts find reference in letter dated 25-02-83 sent to the Sr. Divisional Manager. Even in the alleged previous misconduct there is nothing to warrant inference of his lacking in integrity or having been involved ever in misappropriations for breach of trust etc. The punishment of dismissal is too harsh which in consequences, forfeited all future opportunity of employment and caused pecuniary losses. The workman, in fit of anger may have caused panic but in the next morning he was quit normal and cooperated in completion of the records etc. In the said circumstances my conscience is defiant to maintain the punishment of dismissal which appear shockingly disproportionate. As such, the punishment of dismissal is quashed and substituted by stoppage of three increments permanently. The workman is ordered to be reinstated with all other service benefits save as above. Also, he is not entitled to back wages.

Award accordingly

LUCKNOW (CAMP COURT, NEW DELHI)

18-06-2002.

RUDRESH KUMAR, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 26 जून, 2002

का. आ. 2379.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार देना बैंक के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण/ग्राम न्यायालय, कोलकाता के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 21/1992) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 25-6-2002 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-12012/2/92—आई.आर. (बी-II)]

सी. गंगाधरण, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 26th June, 2002

S.O. 2379.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 21/1992) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Kolkata as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Dena Bank and their workman which was received by the Central Government on 25-6-2002.

[No. L-12012/2/92-IR (B-II)]

C. GANGADHARAN, Under Secy.

ANNEXURE

CENTRAL GOVT INDUSTRIAL  
TRIBUNAL AT KOLKATA

Reference No. 21 of 1992

PARTIES : Employers in relation to the management of  
Dena Bank

AND

Their Management

PRESENT : Mr. Justice Bharat Prasad Sharma

..... Presiding Officer

APPEARANCE :

On behalf of Management : Mr. S. P. Ram, Manager  
(Personnel) of the  
Bank.

On behalf of Workman : Mr. S. Chakraborty,  
Secretary of the Union.

State : West Bengal. : Industry : Banking

Dated : 17th June, 2002.

AWARD

By Order No. L-12012/2/92-IR (B-II) dated 29-4-1992 the Central Government in exercise of its powers under Section 10(1)(d) and (2A) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication:

“Whether the action of the management of Dena Bank in not giving officiating allowance to Sh. Satya Deo Rai as per branch wise seniority is correct or not? If not, what relief the employee is entitled?”

2. When the case is called out today, none appears for either of the parties. On the last date also none appeared. In fact, since I took charge of this Tribunal, none of the representatives of the parties ever appeared, although the case was being adjourned on several occasions. It, however, appears from record that a letter was received from the General Secretary of the sponsoring union stating that the workman concerned has already received the allowance in question and, therefore, it is prayed that the present case be treated as closed.

3. Since the union which espoused the cause of the workman in the present case does not want to proceed with the case and prayed for treating the same as closed, let the present reference be disposed of as a case of no dispute.

B.P. SHARMA, Presiding Officer

Dated, Kollata,

The 17th June, 2002.

नई दिल्ली, 25 जून, 2002

का. आ. 2380.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार बी. बी. एम. बी. प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, चण्डीगढ़ के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 40/99) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 24-6-2002 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-23012/8/98-आई.आर. (सी-II)]

एस. एस. गुप्ता अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 25th June, 2002

S.O. 2380.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes, Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref No 40/99) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Chandigarh as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of BBMB and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 24-06-2002.

[No. L-23012/8/98-IR (C-II)]

S. S. GUPTA, Under Secy.

#### ANNEXURE

BEFORE SHRI S.M. GOEL, PRESIDING OFFICER,  
CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-  
LABOUR COURT, CHANDIGARH.

Case No. ID 40/99

Sh. Rup Lal S/o Sh. Thunia Ram  
C/o Sh. Dhani Ram, General Secretary,  
BSL Project Mazdoor Ekta Union,  
Sundernagar (H.P.) .....Applicant.

Vs.

1. The Chief Engineer,  
B.S.L. Project, B.B.M.B.  
Sundernagar.
2. The Executive Engineer,  
Electrical & Workshop Divn.  
B.B.M.B. Sundernagar (H.P.) ....Respondent.

#### REPRESENTATIVES

For the workman : None

For the management : Sh. D.L. Sharma

#### AWARD

Dated 10-6-2002

The Central Govt. Ministry of Labour vide No. L-23012/8/98/IR(CM-II) dated 11th February, 1999 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication:

“Whether the action of the Chief Engineer, Beas Sutlej Link Project, BBMB, Sundernagar (HP) and Executive, Engineer, Electrical & Workshop Division, BBMB, Sundernagar in disengaging Sh. Rup Lal S/o Sh. Thunia Ram from services in 1993 and terminating his services on 18-10-1996 without notice is just and legal. If not what relief is the workman entitled to?”

2. None appeared on behalf of the workman. It appears that workman is not interested to pursue with the present reference. In view of the above, the present reference is returned to the Central Govt. for want of prosecution. Central Govt. be informed.

S.M. GOEL, Presiding Officer

Chandigarh

Dated : 10-6-2002

नई दिल्ली, 25 जून, 2002

का. आ. 2381.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार बी. बी. एम. बी. प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, चण्डीगढ़ के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 48/96) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 24-6-2002 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-23012/10/95-आई.आर. (सी-II)]

एस. एस. गुप्ता, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 25th June, 2002

S.O. 2381.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 48/96) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Chandigarh as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of BBMB and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 24-06-2002

[No. L-23012/10/95-IR (C-II)]

S. S. GUPTA, Under Secy

### ANNEXURE

BEFORE SHRI S.M. GOEL, PRESIDING OFFICER,  
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL  
TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, CHANDIGARH.

Case No. ID 48/96

The General Secretary,  
BSLP Project Mazdoor Ekta Union,  
Sundernagar, Distt Mandi (H.P.) 174401

.....Applicant.

**Vs.**

1. The Executive Engineer,  
B.B.M.B., Hydrel Channel Division  
Sundernagar (H.P.) 174401

....Respondent.

### REPRESENTATIVES

For the workman : Shri Dhani Ram

For the management : Sh. D.L. Sharma and  
Shri K.C. Goel

### AWARD

Dated 11th June, 2002

The Central Govt. Ministry of Labour vide notification No. L-23012/10/95/IR(C-II) dated 2nd May, 1996 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication:

"Whether the action of the management of BBMB represented through the Executive Engineer BBMB Hydral Channel Division Sundernagar and Chief Engineer BSLP Project Sundernagar in denying the payment of bonus/Electricity Board Allowance for the accounting year 93-94 and 94-95 to daily rated workers employed in the division is just and legal? If not, to what relief the workmen are entitled?"

2. The union filed the claim statement *inter alia* pleading that the employees working on daily wage basis in the divisions are entitled for bonus as per the Bonus Act for the period 1993-94 and 1994-95 amounting to Rs. 5900 and Rs. 2950 to each workman be allowed with 12% interest and prayed that directions may be issued for payment of above mentioned bonus which is due from the employer.

3. In written statement the management pleaded that the respondent management does not come under the Bonus Act as it is not applicable on the management. In the establishment of the management Electricity Board Allowance is being given to the employees and the same is not admissible to daily rated and contingent paid employees. In this regard a settlement was arrived at with the Unions and the management agreed to allow the payment of electricity Board Allowance to all the employees working in the BBMB except daily rated and contingent and this settlement is binding on all the employees and thus the workmen in the reference are not entitled for the claim of bonus. It is thus prayed that reference be rejected.

4. In evidence the applicant filed the affidavit of Dhani Ram as W1 and the management has produced the affidavit of R. D. Sewa XEN as Ex. M1. He has also relied on documents Ex. M2 to M4.

5. I have heard the rep. of the parties and have gone through the evidence and record of the case. The rep. of the workman has argued that the workers who are working on daily wage basis are entitled to bonus under the bonus Act. On the other hand the case of the management is that Bonus Act is not applicable on the establishment of the management as the management is paying Electricity Board Allowance to its employees and the bonus is not paid to the workers of the BBMB. The management has relied on the settlement entered into with all the Unions of the BBMB in which it was stipulated that the bonus is not to be paid to the employees and in its place the Electricity Board Allowance is to be paid to all the workers except the daily rated and contingent paid workers. It is also argued by the rep. of the management that no bonus is paid to the employees under the Bonus Act, thus the workers are not entitled for bonus as demanded by the Union. I have gone through the contentions of the learned representatives of the respective parties. In my considered opinion, The workmen are not entitled to any bonus under the Bonus Act as the same is not applicable on the establishment of the management. It is admitted case of the parties that vide settlement dated 23-9-1987 the management agreed to pay Electricity Board Allowance to all the employees working in the establishment of the management except daily rated and contingent and those power wing employees already getting. This view is also confirmed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Jaswant Singh vs. UOI. This settlement is binding on all the employees. Thus there is no provision in the settlement also for the grant of bonus to daily rated employees. thus the workmen are not entitled for bonus as demanded by them in the present reference. In view of the above, there is no merit in the reference and the same is rejected. The reference is answered accordingly. Central Govt. be informed.

Chandigarh.

Dated 11-6-2002

S. M. GOEL, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 25 जून, 2002

**का. आ. 2382.**—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार श्री. बी. एम. बी. प्रबंधन के संयुक्त नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण चण्डीगढ़ के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 82/96) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 24-6-2002 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-23012/11/95—आई.आर. (सी-II)]

एम. एस. गुप्ता, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 25th June, 2002

**S.O. 2382.**—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref No. 82/96) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Chandigarh as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of BBMB and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 24-06-2002

[No. L-23012/11/95-IR (C-II)]

S. S. GUPTA, Under Secy.

#### ANNEXURE

BEFORE SHRI S.M GOEL, PRESIDING OFFICER,  
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL  
TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, CHANDIGARH

Case No. I. D. 82/96

General Secretary, BSL Project Mazdoor Ekta Union,  
Sundernagar, Distt Mandi (H.P.) 175124

.....Applicant

Vs.

The Executive Engineer,  
B.B.M.B. Pandoh Elect. & Mech. Division  
Pandoh (H.P.) 175001

.....Respondent

#### REPRESENTATIVES

For the workman : Shri Dhani Ram

For the management : Sh. D.L. Sharma & Shri  
K.C. Goel

#### AWARD

Dated 11th June, 2002

The Central Govt. Ministry of Labour vide No. L-23012/11/95/I.R.(C-II) dated 6th September, 1996 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication:—

“Whether the action of the management of BBMB represented through the Executive, Engineer, BBMB, Pandoh and Elect. & Mech Division, Pandoh and Chief Engineer BSL Project, Sundernagar in denying the payment of bonus/Electricity Board Allowance for the accounting year 93-94 and 94-95 to daily rated workers employed in the division is just and legal? If not, to what relief the workmen concerned are entitled to?”

2. The union filed the claim statement *inter alia* pleading that the employees working on daily wage basis in the divisions are entitled for bonus as per the Bonus Act for the period 1993-94 and 1994-95 amounting to Rs. 20,650/- with interest of Rs. 12% and prayed that directions may be issued for payment of above mentioned bonus which is due from the employer

3. In written statement the management pleaded that the respondent management does not come under the Bonus Act as it is not applicable on the management. In the establishment of the management Electricity Board allowance is being given to the employees and the same is not admissible to daily rated and contingent paid employees. In this regard a settlement was arrived at with the Unions and the management agreed to allow the payment of electricity Board Allowance to all the employees working in the BBMB except daily rated and contingent and this settlement is binding on all the employees and thus the workmen in the reference are not entitled for the claim of bonus. It is thus prayed that reference be rejected.

4. In evidence the applicant filed the affidavit of Dhani Ram as W1 and the management has produced the affidavit of R. D. Sewa XEN as Ex. M1. He has also relied on documents Ex. M2 to M4.

5. I have heard the rep. of the parties and have gone through the evidence and record of the case. The rep. of the workman has argued that the workers who are working on daily wage basis are entitled to bonus under the bonus Act. On the other hand the case of the management is that bonus Act is not applicable on the establishment of the management as the management is paying electricity board allowance to its employees and the bonus is not paid to the workers of the BBMB. The management has relied on the settlement entered into with all the Union of the BBMB in which it was stipulated that the bonus is not to be paid to the employees and in its place the electricity Board allowance is to be paid to all the workers except the daily rated and contingent paid workers. It is also argued by the rep. of the management that no bonus is paid to the employees under the Bonus Act, thus the workers are not entitled for bonus as demanded by the Union. I have gone through the contentions of the learned representatives of the respective parties. In my considered opinion, the workmen are not entitled to any bonus under the Bonus Act as the same is not applicable on the establishment of the management. It is admitted case of the parties that vide



settlement dated 23-9-1987 the management agreed to pay Electricity Board Allowance to all the employees working in the establishment of the management except daily rated and contingent and those power wing employees already getting. This view is also confirmed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of *Jaswant Singh vs. UOI*. Thus there is no provision in the settlement also for the grant of bonus to daily rated employees. Thus the workmen are not entitled for bonus as demanded by them in the present reference. In view of the above, there is no merit in the reference and the same is rejected. The reference is answered, accordingly. Central Government be informed.

Chandigarh

Dated 11/6/2002

S M. GOEL, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 25 जून, 2002

का. आ. 2383.— औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 ( 1947 का 14 ) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार बी. बी. एम. बी. प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण का निर्वाह के पंचाट ( संदर्भ संख्या 91/96 ) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 24-6-2002 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[ सं. एल 23012/13/95--आई.आर. (सी-II) ]

एस. एस. गुप्ता, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 25th June, 2002

**S.O. 2383.**—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref No 91/96) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court Chandigarh as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of BBMB and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 24-06-2002

[No L-23012/13/95--IR(C-II)]

S S GUPTA, Under Secy

#### ANNEXURE

BEFORE SHRI S M GOEL, PRESIDING OFFICER  
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL  
TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, CHANDIGARH

Case No I D 91/96

General Secretary, BSL Project Mazdoor Ekta Union,  
Sundernagar, Distt Mandi (H.P) 174401

Applicant

#### Versus

The Executive Engineer,  
BBMB Township Division  
Sundernagar, Distt. Mandi (H.P) 174401

....Respondent

#### REPRESENTATIVES

For the workman . Shri Dhani Ram

For the management . Sh D.L. Sharma &  
Shri K.C. Goel

#### AWARD

Chandigarh, 11th July, 2002

The Central Government Ministry of Labour vide No. L-23012/13/95/IR(C-II) dated 26-9-1996 has referred the following disputes to this Tribunal for adjudication:

“Whether the action of the management of BBMB represented through the Executive Engineer, BBMB Township Division, Sundernagar, Pandoh and Chief Engineer, BSL Project, Sundernagar in denying the payment of bonus/Electricity Board Allowance for the accounting years 1993-94 and 1994-95 to daily rated workers employed in the division is just and legal? If not, to what relief the workmen are entitled to?”

2. The union filed the claim statement *inter-alia* pleading that the employees working on daily wage basis in the divisions are entitled for bonus as per the Bonus Act for the period 1993-94 and 1994-95 amounting to Rs 1,51,700 with interest of Rs 12% and prayed that directions may be issued for payment of above mentioned bonus which is due from the employer.

3. In written statement the management pleaded that the respondent management does not come under the Bonus Act as it is not applicable on the management. In the establishment of the management, Electricity Board allowance is being given to the employees and the same is not admissible to daily rated and contingent paid employees. In this regard a settlement was arrived at with the Unions and the management agreed to allow the payment of Electricity Board Allowance to all the employees working in the BBMB except daily rated and contingent and this settlement is binding on all the employees and thus the workmen in the reference are not entitled for the claim of bonus. It is thus prayed that reference be rejected.

4. In evidence the applicant filed the affidavit of Dhani Ram as W1 and the management has produced the affidavit of R. D Sewa XEN as Ex. M1. He has also relied on documents Ex. M2 to M4.

5. I have heard the rep. of the parties and have gone through the evidence and record of the case. The rep. of the workmen has argued that the workers who are working on daily wage basis are entitled to bonus under the Bonus Act. On the other hand the case of the management is that Bonus Act is not applicable on the establishment of the management as the management is paying electricity board allowance to its employees and the bonus is not paid to

the workers of the BBMB. The management has relied on the settlement entered into with all the Unions of the BBMB in which it was stipulated that the bonus is not to be paid to the employees and in its place the electricity Board allowance is to be paid to all the workers except the daily rated and contingent paid workers. It is also argued by the rep. of the management that no bonus is paid to the employees under the Bonus Act, thus the workers are not entitled for bonus as demanded by the Union. I have gone through the contentions of the learned representatives of the respective parties. In my considered opinion, the workmen are not entitled to any bonus under the Bonus Act as the same is not applicable on the establishment of the management. It is admitted case of the parties that vide settlement dated 23-9-1987 the management agreed to pay Electricity Board Allowance to all the employees working in the establishment of the management except daily rated and contingent and those power wing employees already getting. This view is also confirmed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of *Jaswant Singh vs. UOI*. This settlement is binding on all the employees. Thus there is no provision in the settlement also for the grant of bonus to daily rated employees. Thus the workmen are not entitled for bonus as demanded by them in the present reference. In view of the above, there is no merit in the reference and the same is rejected. The reference is answered accordingly. Central Government be informed.

Chandigarh.

Dated : 11-6-2002

S.M. GOEL, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 25 जून, 2002

**क्रा. आ. 2384.**—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार बी. बी. एम. बी. के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, चण्डीगढ़ के पंचाट (संदर्भ सं. 92/96) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 24-6-2002 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[ सं. एल-23012/14/95-आई.आर. (सी. II) ]

एस. एस. गुप्ता, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 25th June, 2002

**S.O. 2384.**—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 92/96) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Chandigarh as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of BBMB and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on 24-6-2002.

[No. L-23012/14/95-IR(C-II)]

S. S. GUPTA, Under Secy.

## ANNEXURE

BEFORE SHRI S. M. GOEL, PRESIDING OFFICER,  
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-  
CUM-LABOUR COURT, CHANDIGARH

Case No. I.D. 92/96

The General Secretary, BSL Project Mazdoor Ekta Union,  
Sundernagar, Distt. Mandi (HP) 174401

.....Applicant

Versus

The Executive Engineer, BBMB, B.R.S.C. & P.D. Division  
Sundernagar (H.P.) 174401

.....Respondent

## REPRESENTATIVES

For the workman Shri Dhani Ram

For the Management Shri D.L. Sharma and  
Shri K.C. Goel

## AWARD

Chandigarh, the 11th June, 2002

The Central Government Ministry of Labour vide Notification No. L-23012/14/95-IR(C-II) dated 26th September, 1996 has referred the following disputes to this Tribunal for adjudication

“Whether the action of the management of BBMB represented through the Executive Engineer, BBMB BRSC and PD Division Sundernagar, HP and Chief Engineer BSL Project, Sundernagar in denying the payment of bonus/Electricity Board Allowance for the accounting years 1993-94 and 1994-95 to daily rated workers employed in the division is just and legal? If not, what relief the workman concerned is entitled to?”

The union filed the claim statement *inter alia* pleading that the employees working on daily wage basis in the divisions are entitled for bonus as per the Bonus Act for the period 1993-94, and 1994-95 amounting to Rs. 60,390 and prayed that directions may be issued for payment of above mentioned bonus which is due from the employer.

3. In written statement the management pleaded that the respondent management does not come under the Bonus Act as it is not applicable on the management. In the establishment the management, Electricity Board Allowance is being given to the employees and the same is not admissible to daily rated and contingent paid employees. In this regard a settlement was arrived at with the Unions and the management agreed to allow the payment of electricity board allowance to all the employees working in the BBMB except daily rated and contingent and this settlement is binding on all the employees and thus the workmen in the reference are not entitled for the claim of bonus. It is thus prayed that reference be rejected.

4. In evidence the applicant filed the affidavit of Dhani Ram as W1 and the management has produced the affidavit of R.D. Sewa XEN as Ex. M1. He has also relied on documents Ex. M2 to M4

5. I have heard the rep. of the parties and have gone through the evidence and record of the case. The rep. of the workman has argued that the workers who are working on daily wage basis are entitled to bonus under the Bonus Act. On the other hand the case of the management is that Bonus Act is not applicable on the establishment of the management as the management is paying electricity board allowance to its employees and the bonus is not paid to the workers of the BBMB. The management has relied on the settlement entered into with all the Union of the BBMB in which it was stipulated that the bonus is not to be paid to the employees and in its place the electricity Board allowance is to be paid to all the workers except the daily rated and contingent paid workers. It is also argued by the rep. of the management that no bonus is paid to the employees under the Bonus Act, thus the workers are not entitled for bonus as demanded by the Union. I have gone through the contention of the learned representatives of the respective parties. In my considered opinion, the workmen are not entitled to any bonus under the Bonus Act as the same is not applicable on the establishment of the management. It is admitted case of the parties that vide settlement dated 23-9-1987 the management agreed to pay Electricity Board Allowance to all the employees working in the establishment of the management except daily rated and contingent and those power wing employees already getting. This view is also confirmed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of *Jaswant Singh Vs. UOI*. This settlement is binding on all the employees. Thus there is no provision in the settlement also for the grant of bonus to daily rated employees. Thus the workmen are not entitled for bonus as demanded by them in the present reference. In view of the above, there is no merit in the reference and the same is rejected. The reference is answered accordingly. Central Govt. be informed

Chandigarh  
Dated : 11-6-2002

S. M. GOEL, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 25 जून, 2002

का. आ.2385.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार बी. बी. एम. बी. के प्रबंधन के संबंध नियोक्तों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, चण्डीगढ़ के पंचाट (संदर्भ सं. 49/99) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 24-6-2002 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-23012/17/98-आई.आर.(सी. II)]

एस. एस. गुप्ता, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 25th June, 2002

**S.O. 2385.**—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 49/99) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Chandigarh as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of BBMB and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 24-6-2002.

[No. L-23012/17/98-IR(C-II)]

S. S. GUPTA, Under Secy.

#### ANNEXURE

BEFORE SHRI S. M. GOEL PRESIDING OFFICER,  
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-  
CUM-LABOUR COURT, CHANDIGARH

Case No. I.D. 49/99

Sh. Damodar Dass S/o Sh. Devi Dass  
C/o Sh. Dhani Ram, General Secretary, BSL Project  
Mazdoor Ekta Union, Sundernagar, (HP).

.....Applicant

Versus

1. The Chief Engineer,  
BSL Project, BBMB,  
Sundernagar.

2. The Executive Engineer,  
Township Division, BRSC Division,  
BBMB, Sundernagar.

.....Respondent

#### REPRESENTATIVES

For the Workman : None.

For the Management : Shri D.L. Sharma

#### AWARD

Dated : 10th June, 2002

The Central Govt. Ministry of Labour vide Notification No. L-23012/17/98-IR(CM-II) dated 11th February, 1999 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication

"Whether the action of the Chief Engineer, Beas Sutlej Link Project, BBMB Sundernagar (HP) and Executive Engineer, BRSC Division B B.M.B. Sundernagar in disengaging Sh. Damodar Dass S/o Sh. Devi Dass from services in 1996 and terminating his services on 18.10.1996 without notice is just and legal? If not, what relief the workman concerned is entitled to?"

2. None appeared on behalf of the workman. It appears that workman is not interested to pursue with the present reference. In view of above, the present reference is returned to the Central Govt. for want of prosecution. Central Govt. be informed.

Chandigarh  
Dated : 10-6-2002

S.M. GOEL, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 25 जून, 2002

**का. आ. 2386.**—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार बी. बी. एम. बी. के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, चण्डीगढ़ पंचाट (संदर्भ सं. 59/99) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 24-6-2002 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-23012/51/98-आई.आर.(सी. II)]

एस. एस. गुप्ता, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 25th June, 2002

**S.O. 2386.**—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 59/99) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Chandigarh as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of BBMB and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 24-6-2002.

[No. L-23012/51/98-IR(C-II)]

S. S. GUPTA, Under Secy.

#### ANNEXURE

BEFORE SHRI S. M. GOEL PRESIDING OFFICER,  
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL  
TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,  
CHANDIGARH

Case No. I D. 59/99

Sh. Karam Singh S/o Sh. Sant Ram C/o Sh. Dhanu Ram,  
General Secretary, BSL Project Mazdoor Ekta Union,  
S-2/773, Sundernagar, Distt. Mandi (HP)

..... Applicant

Vs.

1. The Chief Engineer,  
BSL Project, BBMB,  
Sundernagar.
2. The Executive Engineer,  
Township Division,  
BBMB, Sundernagar.

..... Respondent

#### REPRESENTATIVES

For the workman : None.

For the Management : Shri D L. Sharma

#### AWARD

Dated : 10th June, 2002

The Central Govt. Ministry of Labour vide Notification No. L-23012/51/98-IR(CM-II) dated 17th February, 1999 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :

“Whether the action of the Chief Engineer, Beas Sutlej Link Project, BBMB Sundernagar (HP) and Executive Engineer, HC & BG Division B.B.M.B. Sundernagar, Distt. Mandi (HP) in terminating the services Sh. Karam Singh S/o Sh. Sant Ram on 18-10-96 without notice is just and legal? If not, what relief the workman is entitled to?”

2. None appeared on behalf of the workman. It appears that workman is not interested with the present reference. In view of the above the present reference is returned to the Central Govt. for want of prosecution. Central Govt. be informed.

Chandigarh

Dated : 10-6-2002

S.M. GOEL, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 25 जून, 2002

**का. आ. 2387.**—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार बी. बी. एम. बी. के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, चण्डीगढ़ पंचाट (संदर्भ सं. 10/2001) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 24-6-2002 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-23012/6/2000-आई.आर.(सी. II)]

एस. एस. गुप्ता, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 25th June, 2002

**S.O. 2387.**—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 10/2001) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Chandigarh as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of BBMB and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 24-6-2002.

[No. L-23012/6/2000-IR(C-II)]

S. S. GUPTA, Under Secy

#### ANNEXURE

BEFORE SHRI S.M. GOEL PRESIDING OFFICER,  
CENTRAL GOVT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-  
LABOUR COURT, CHANDIGARH

Case No. ID 10/2001.

Mohinder Singh Son of Khan Singh Village & P.O.  
Maramsit, Teh & Distt. Mandi (H.P.)

.....Applicant.

Vs.

The Chief Engineer, Bhakra Beas Management Board,  
BSL Project, Sundernagar (H.P.) Sundernagar.

.....Respondent.

## APPEARANCES

For the workman      Shri Dhani Ram  
For the management      Shri D.L. Sharma with  
   K C Goel

## AWARD

Dated 10th June, 2002.

The Central Govt. Ministry of Labour vide Notification No. L-23012/6/2000/IR (CM II) dated 21st of November, 2000 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication

“Whether the action of the Chief Engineer, BSL Project, BBMB Sundernagar (HP) and Executive Engineer, Electrical and workshop Division, BBMB Sundernagar, District Mandi (HP) in disengaging Shri Mahender Singh from services on 19-10-1996 (FN) without notice is legal and justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?”

2. On the application of the representative of the workmen, the cases stated below had been consolidated with ID 10/2001 Mohinder Singh Vs. Chief Engineer, BBMB, BSL Sundernagar. I.D. No. 10/2001 shall be the leading case. The facts and law involved in all these cases are the same. This award will operate in all the cases listed below. Let copy of this award be placed in all the files. The award will equally operate on all the connected cases.

Sr. No	I.D. No.	Name of the Petitioner	Reference No. & date
1	2	3	4
1	98/98	Mohinder Kumar son of Johali Ram	L-23012/21/97/IR (C. M-I dated 20-5-1998)
2	99/98	Maya Ram son of Jalpu Ram	L-23012/17/IR (M-11) dated 20-5-1998.
3	110/98	Jagat Ram S/o Basakhu Ram	L-22012/36/97/IR (CM-II) dated 11-6-1998
4	117/98	Baldev Singh S/o Sh. Nanoo Ram	L-23012/35/97/IR (CM-II) dated 25-5-1998
5	134/98	Dharam Dass S/o Sh. Hirda Ram	L-23012/18/97/IR (CM-II) dated 20-7-1998
6	135/98	Dharam Chand S/o Sh. Jankoo	L-23012/15/97/IR (CM-II) dated 20-7-1998

1	2	3	4
7.	136/98	Sita Ram S/o Thakroo	L-23012/18/97/IR (CM-II) dated 20-7-1998
8.	137/98	Sita Ram S/o Phagnu	L-23012/14/97/IR (CM-II) dated 20-7-1998
9.	138/98	Kishan Chand S/o Sh. Santoo Ram	L-23012/19/97/IR (CM-II) dated 20-7-1998
10	139/98	Savnamu Ram S/o Daya Ram	L-23012/33/97/IR (CM-II) dated 22-7-1998
11	140/98	Bhikham Ram S/o Phagnu Ram	L-23012/47/97/IR (CM-II) dated 22-7-1998
12	142/98	Maghu Ram S/o Shivalu	L-23012/34/97/IR (CM-II) dated 22-7-1998
13	143/98	Ludar S/o Bardu	L-23012/28/97/IR (CM-II) dated 22-7-1998
14.	144/98	Himat Ram S/o Katku	L-23012/49/97/IR (CM-II) dated 22-7-1998
15.	145/98	Sita Ram S/o Bhogu Ram	L-23012/40/97/IR (CM-II) dated 22-7-1998
16	162/98	Sita Ram S/o Kansi Ram	L-23012/27/97/IR (CM-II) dated Nil
17.	163/98	Sidhu Ram S/o Devi Singh	L-23012/9/97/IR (CM-II) dated 27/31-7-1998
18.	165/98	Hem Raj S/o Bhagat	L-23012/11/97/IR (CM-II) dated 27/31-7-1998
19.	167/98	Ashok Kumar S/o Mohan Lal	L-23012/29/97/IR (CM-II) dated 28-31-7-1998
20	168/98	Parkash Chand S/o Net Ram	L-23012/56/97/IR (CM-II) dated 29/31-7-1998
21.	169/98	Netar Singh S/o Nanku	L-23012/63/97/IR (CM-II) dated 29/31-7-1998
22.	170/98	Chand S/o Thakru	L-23012/69/97/IR (CM-II) dated 29/31-7-1998

1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
23	172/98	Sant Ram S/o Devanoo	L-23012/30/97/IR (CM-II) dated 29/31-7-1998	39	205/98	Bhagmal S/o Purkhoo Ram	L-23012/27/98/IR (CM-II) dated 27-10-1998
24	174/98	Ganga Ram S/o Bhargi Ram	L-23012/54/97/IR (CM-II) dated 29/31-7-1998	40	206/98	Bangaloo S/o Santu	L-23012/29/98/IR (CM-II) dated 27-10-1998
25	175/98	Singh Ram S/o Gujju	L-23012/52/97/IR (CM-II) dated 22/31-7-1998	41	207/98	Hem Singh S/o Med Ram	L-23012/32/98/IR (CM-II) dated 27-10-1998
26	176/98	Nek Ram S/o Tissru Ram	L-23012/65/97/IR (CM-II) dated 29/31-7-1998	42	208/98	Roop Singh S/o Gandhi Ram	L-23012/33/98/IR (CM-II) dated 27-10-1998
27	191/98	Sewak Ram S/o Tarru Ram	L-23012/13/97/IR (CM-II) dated 14-9-1998	43	209/98	Krishan Lal S/o Devku Ram	L-23012/34/98/IR (CM-II) dated 27-10-1998
28	194/98	Paras Ram S/o Thardo Ram	L-23012/1/98/IR (CM-II) dated 27-10-1998	44	210/98	Hari Singh S/o Sh Goverdhan Ram	L-23012/35/98/IR (CM-II) dated 27-10-1998
29	195/98	Prabhu Ram S/o Lachhman	L-23012/2/98/IR (CM-II) dated 27-10-1998	45	211/98	Krishan Kumar S/o Bahadur	L-23012/36/98/IR (CM-II) dated 27-10-1998
30	196/98	Kali Das S/o Gulu	L-23012/4/98/IR (CM-II) dated 27-10-1998	46	212/98	Inder Dev S/o Nanku Ram	L-23012/38/98/IR (CM-II) dated 27-10-1998
31	197/98	Durga Dass S/o Thakur Dass	L-23012/5/98/IR (CM-II) dated 27-5-1998	47	214/98	Paras Ram S/o Sant Ram	L-23012/43/98/IR (CM-II) dated 27-10-1998
32	198/98	Singh Ram S/o Pithu Ram	L-23012/6/98/IR (CM-II) dated 27-10-1998	48	215/98	Roohan Lal S/o Khalu Ram	L-23012/44/98/IR (CM-II) dated 27-10-1998
33	199/98	Paras Ram S/o Lohala Ram	L-23012/7/98/IR (CM-II) dated 27-10-1998	49	216/98	Bristu Ram S/o Damana Ram	L-23012/45/98/IR (CM-II) dated 27-10-1998
34	200/98	Chaman Lal S/o Khushi Ram	L-23012/8/98/IR (CM-II) dated 27-10-1998	50	218/98	Joginder Singh S/o Sohan Singh	L-23012/31/98/IR (CM-II) dated 28-10-1998
35	201/98	Dila Ram S/o Bhagi Ram	L-23012/9/98/IR (CM-II) dated 27-10-1998	51	250/98	Jagat Ram S/o Lachhman	L-23012/51/97/IR (CM-II) dated 10-11-1998
36	202/98	Ghungru Ram S/o Karam Chand	L-23012/10/98/IR (CM-II) dated 27-10-1998	52	251/98	Het Ram S/o Rattan Lal	L-23012/66/97/IR (CM-II) dated 10-11-1998
37	203/98	Dagu S/o Kunan	L-23012/11/98/IR (CM-II) dated 27-10-1998	53	252/98	Munshi Ram S/o Balak Ram	L-23012/50/97/IR (CM-II) dated 10-11-1998
38	204/98	Vebbhav Ram S/o Bholu	L-23012/12/98/IR (CM-II) dated 27-10-1998	54	253/98	Vishnu S/o Jalam	L-23012/48/97/IR (CM-II) dated 10-11-1998

1	2	3	4
55.	254/98	Tardu Ram S/o Chamaru Ram	L-23012/52/97/IR (CM-II) dated 10-11-1998
56.	256/98	Kashmir Singh S/o Guju Ram	L-23012/41/97/IR (CM-II) dated 10-11-1998
57.	257/98	Molu S/o Heera	L-23012/57/97/IR (CM-II) dated 10-11-1998
58.	259/98	Chint Ram S/o Durga Singh	L-23012/58/97/IR (CM-II) dated 10-11-1998
59.	260/98	Palu Ram S/o Jogira Ram	L-23012/43/97/IR (CM-II) dated 10-11-1998
60.	261/98	Lehar S/o Kundan	L-23012/53/97/IR (CM-II) dated 10-11-1998
61.	262/98	Vijay Kumar S/o Puran Chand	L-23012/59/97/IR (CM-II) dated 10-11-1998
62.	263/98	Teju S/o Titlu	L-23012/70/97/IR (CM-II) dated 10-11-1998
63.	264/98	Roshan Lal S/o Mallu Ram	L-23012/46/97/IR (CM-II) dated 10-11-1998
64.	34/99	Gavanoo Ram S/o Phittu Ram	L-23012/20/98/IR (CM-II) dated 10-2-1999
65.	36/99	Nakhu Ram S/o Punu Ram	L-23012/13/98/IR (CM-II) dated 10-2-1999
66.	38/99	Udham Singh S/o Thunthi Ram	L-23012/21/98/IR (CM-II) dated 10-2-1999
67.	39/99	Vijaya Kumar S/o Tirath Ram	L-23012/23/98/IR (CM-II) dated 10-2-1998
68.	41/99	Bhagat Ram S/o Mani Ram	L-23012/9/98/IR (CM-II) dated 10-11/2/1999
69.	42/99	Narain Dass S/o Maghru Ram	L-23012/40/98/IR (CM-II) dated 10-2-1999
70.	43/99	Tara Chand S/o Bansi Lal	L-23012/42/98/IR (CM-II) dated 10-2-1999

1	2	3	4
71.	44/99	Sher Singh S/o Jiwan Ram	L-23012/37/98/IR (CM-II) dated 10-2-1999
72.	46/99	Yadvender S/o Banshi Lal	L-23012/16/98/IR (CM-II) dated 10-11/2/1999
73.	47/99	Dhani Ram S/o Ganga Ram	L-23012/15/98/IR (CM-II) dated 10-11/2/1999
74.	50/99	Devi Singh S/o Gayanu	L-23012/28/98/IR (CM-II) dated 10-2-1999
75.	118/99	Todar S/o Bhagat Ram	L-23012/60/98/IR (CM-II) dated 4-5-1999
76.	135/99	Katku S/o Billu	L-23012/64/98/IR (CM-II) dated 25-5-1999
77.	136/99	Narain S/o Premoo	L-23012/57/98/IR (CM-II) dated 25-5-1999
78.	63/2k	Chuni Lal S/o Murli Ram	L-23012/9/99/IR (CM-II) dated 21-1-2000
79.	131/2k	Baldev S/o Fagnoo	L-23012/7/99/IR (CM-II) dated 29-2-2000
80.	132/2k	Gulab Singh S/o Zalam Ram	L-23012/8/99/IR (CM-II) dated 23-2-2000
81.	133/2k	Mat S/o Rothal	L-23012/10/99/IR (CM-II) dated 29-2-2000
82.	134/2k	Moti Ram S/o Churu Ram	L-23012/12/99/IR (CM-II) dated 29-2-2000
83.	135/2k	Bansi Lal S/o Balku	L-23012/13/99/IR (CM-II) dated 23-2-2000
84.	145/2k	Rattan Lal S/o Jamnu Ram	L-23012/11/99/IR (CM-II) dated 7-3-2000
85.	10/2k1	Mohinder Singh S/o Khan Singh	L-23012/6/2000/IR (CM-II) dated 21-11-2000
86.	11/2k1	Sant Ram S/o Thakur Dass	L-23012/4/2000/IR (CM-II) dated 23-11-2000

1	2	3	4
87.	33/2k1	Polo Ram S/o Souju Ram	L-23012/5/2000/IR (C-II) dated 29-1-2001
88.	35/2k1	Rajinder S/o Durga Dev	L-22012/8/2000/IR (C-II) dated Nil
89.	64/2k1	Roshan Lal S/o Bhadur Singh	L-23012/7/2000/IR (C-II) dated 5-2-2001
90.	65/2k1	Lal Singh S/o Joti Ram	L-23012/9/2000/IR (C-II) dated 5-2-2001
91.	170/01	Dharam Singh S/o Kala Ram	L-23012/13/2000/IR (C-II) dated 12-4-2001
92.	171/01	Hari Ram S/o Dhani Ram	L-23012/14/2000/IR (C-II) dated 12-4-2001
93.	172/2k1	Paras Ram S/o Mani Ram	L-23012/15/2000/IR (C-II) dated 12-4-2001
94.	173/2k1	Sher Singh S/o Dutt Ram	L-23012/16/2000/IR (C-II) dated 12-4-2001
95.	174/2k1	Jagdish Kumar S/o Goverdhan Singh	L-23012/19/2000/IR (C-II) dated 12-4-2001
96.	175/2k1	Gaur Singh S/o Chand Ram	L-23012/11/2000/IR (C-II) dated 12-4-2001
97.	176/2k1	Balbir Chand S/o Ram Kishan	L-23012/11/2000/IR (C-II) dated 12-4-2001
98.	177/2k1	Sher Singh S/o Bahadur Singh	L-23012/17/2000/IR (C-II) dated 26-4-2001
99.	100/2k1	Raj Kumar S/o Kali Dass	L-23012/12/2000/IR (C-II) dated 22-3-2001
100.	241/2k1	Muni Lal S/o Sawanoo	L-23012/20/2000/IR (C-II) dated 14-6-2001

3. In all the above mentioned cases, the brief facts are the same. As per the applicants, they were working on daily wages with the management in different divisions of the respondent in different trades. Their services were terminated by the management and no notice or retrenchment compensation was paid to them which is

gross violation of Section 25-F of the I.D. Act, 1947 though the management had the work for which they were employed. It is also pleaded that all the workmen have completed more than 240 days of service at the time of termination of their services. It is also contended that the management had employed outsiders ignoring the claim of the workman and preference as envisaged U/S 25-H of the I.D. Act was also not given to the workmen. The applicants in all the cases have demanded that they may be reinstated in service with full back wages and continuity of service.

4. The management in written statements have taken preliminary objection that the present dispute is not legally maintainable. It is pleaded that the applicants have gone to the Hon'ble Himachal High Court in Writ Petition No. 1291/95 for regularisation of their services and for taking them in workcharged establishment and to make the petitioner regular on the basis of policy decision. The Hon'ble High Court vide order dated 16-8-1995 directed the management to re-engage them till further orders. Accordingly, the petitioners were taken on duty on daily wage basis in compliance of the above order. The said writ petition was finally disposed of on 9-10-1996 with the directions that the applicant will make representation to Chief Engineer BSL which will be considered according to the directions given on 9-10-1986. In the directions dated 9-10-1986 it was contemplated that if the petitioner had completed 240 days of continuous services on 31-8-1993 his case for regularisation against the vacant posts if available on 31-8-1993 is to be considered in accordance with the policy instructions of the Board as per letter dated 3-1-1996. It is also observed by the Hon'ble High Court that it is not possible to give directions to the Board to continue their services and it is open to the management to take such action as may be necessary even before the consideration of the representation. Accordingly, the services of applicants were disengaged on 18-10-1996 after the vacation of the exparte direction of reengagement. It is specifically pleaded by the management that all the workmen have not completed 240 days of continuous service in 12 calendar months as defined under the Act preceding 31-8-1993 i.e. cut of date as laid down by the Hon'ble High Court in the directions dated 9-10-1996. It is admitted that the workmen have worked up to 18-10-1996 but this service from 31-8-1993 to 9-1-1996 cannot be considered and taken into account for calculating the number of working days as per the provisions of Section 25-F of the I.D. Act and the services rendered by them is not to be taken into account except for any purpose whatsoever except the wages paid to them during this period. It was thus prayed that, the applicants have no case and prayed for the rejections of the reference.

5. The facts of the cases are not in dispute. It is admitted by the management that all the workmen have completed 240 days of continuous service immediately



preceding before 18-10-1996 by virtue of the interim order passed in the writ petition. It is so stated in reply filed by the management to the application filed by the applicant in the main case.

6. Thus the controversy boils to the situation whether the extended period rendered by the workman up to 18-10-1996 by virtue of the interim order passed by the Hon'ble High Court would be considered for counting the number of working days for the purpose of completion of mandatory 240 days in one calendar year or not. It is admitted case of the petitioners and the respondents that up to the cut off date i.e. 31-8-1993 the applicants had not completed 240 days of continuous service and it is only by virtue of directions of the Hon'ble High Court the applicants have worked up to 18-10-1996 and completed 240 days of service.

7. I have heard the representatives of the parties and have also gone through the record of the cases. The rep. of the workman has vehemently argued that the extended period of service should also be considered for the purpose of completion of 240 days of service and this period can not be excluded and the applicants are entitled to retrenchment compensation and notice etc. and the management has not complied with the provisions of Section 25-F, the applicants are entitled for reinstatement in service with full back wages and other attendant benefits. For his arguments he has relied on the authority of the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in CWP No. 17018/99 Darshan Kumar and others Versus BBMB wherein it was held by the Hon'ble High Court that though the applicants in the above writ petition were in service of the management by virtue of the stay granted by the Court they are entitled to be considered for regularisation as per the policy of the management. On the other hand the rep. of the management has relied on the authority of the Hon'ble High Court in the case of Panipat Thermal Power Project Station and State of Haryana reported in 2(L.L.N.) 1996 735. In this case the Hon'ble High court has held that the period during which the workman was working under the orders of the court cannot be taken into account for counting the stipulated period of 240 days. Admittedly if this period is excluded the workmen have not completed 240 days of service with the management. This following the law laid down by the Hon'ble High court in the above noted case law, I have no other option but to hold that the workmen have not completed 240 days of service with the management, the management was not bound to comply with the provisions of Section 25-F of the I.D. Act, 1947. The case law cited by the rep. of the workman was of regularisation and not for the purpose of complying the provisions of Section 25-F of the I.D. Act. No other authority was cited before me by the parties regarding the completion of 240 days. Thus I hold that action of the management in disengaging the workmen is justified and

the workmen are not entitled to any relief. References are answered accordingly. Central Govt. be informed.

Chandigarh.

Dated : 10-6-2002.

S.M. GOEL, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 25 जून, 2002

का. आ. 2388.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार बी. बी. एस. बी. के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद से केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, चण्डीगढ़ पंचाट (संदर्भ सं. 45/99) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 24-6-2002 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[ सं. एल-23012/3/98-आई.आर.(सी. II) ]

एस. एस. गुप्ता, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 25th June, 2002

S.O. 2388.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 45/99) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Chandigarh as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of BBMB and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 24-6-2002.

[No. L-23012/3/98-IR(C-II)]

S. S. GUPTA, Under Secy.

#### ANNEXURE

BEFORE SHRI S. M. GOEL PRESIDING OFFICER,  
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL  
TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,  
CHANDIGARH

Case No. I.D. 45/99

Sh. Ram Singh S/o Sh. Sawanu Ram  
C/o Sh. Dhani Ram, General Secretary, BSL  
Project Mazdoor Ekta Union, Sundernagar, (H.P.)

.....Applicant

Vs.

1. The Chief Engineer,  
BSL Project, BBMB,  
Sundernagar.
2. The Executive Engineer,  
Township Division,  
BBMB, Sundernagar, (H.P.)

.....Respondent

## REPRESENTATIVES

For the workman : None.

For the Management : None.

## AWARD

Dated : 10th June, 2002

The Central Govt. Ministry of Labour vide Notification No. L-23012/3/98-IR(CM-II) dated 11th February, 1999 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication.

“Whether the action of the Chief Engineer, Beas Sutlej Link Project, B.B.M.B. Sundernagar (HP) and Executive Engineer, Township Division B.B.M.B. Sundernagar, in disengaging Sh. Ram Singh S/o Sh. Sawanu Ram from services in 1992 and terminating his services on 18-10-1996 without notice is just and legal? If not, what relief the workman is entitled to?”

2. None appeared on behalf of the workman. It appears that workman is not interested to pursue with the present reference. In view of above, the present reference is returned to the Central Govt. for want of prosecution. Central Govt. be informed.

Chandigarh

Dated : 10-6-2002

S. M. GOEL, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 25 जून, 2002

का.आ. 2389.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एम.सी.एल. के प्रबंधन के संबंधित नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण भुवनेश्वर पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 76/2001) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 24-6-2002 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-22012/499/99-आई.आर. (सी-II)]

एस. एस. गुप्ता, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 25th June, 2002

S.O. 2389.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 76/2001) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Bhubneshwar as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of MCL and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 24-6-2002.

[No. L-22012/499/99--IR(C-II)]

S. S. GUPTA, Under Secy.

## ANNEXURE

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL  
TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT  
BHUBANESHWAR

## PRESENT :

Shri S.K. DHAL, OSJS, (Sr. Branch),  
Presiding Officer, C.G.I.T.-cum-Labour Court  
Bhubaneshwar

## Tr. INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE CASE NO. 76/2002

Date of conclusion of hearing—30th May 2002

Date of Passing Award—12th June, 2002

## BETWEEN :

The Management of the Secretary,  
Orient Area, M.C. Ltd., P.O. Brajrajnagar,  
Distt. Jhardsuguda.

1st Party-Management

## AND

Their Workmen, represented through the

General Secretary,  
Brajrajnagar, Coal Mines Workers Union,  
At/PO. Orient Colliery,  
Via Brajrajnagar, Jhuarsuguda,

2nd Party-Union.

## APPEARANCES :

Shri Santosh Kumar Panigrahi,  
Legal Inspector (Tr.) : For the 1st Party-  
Management

None : For the 2nd Party-  
Union

## AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) and sub-section 2(A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) have referred the following dispute for adjudication vide their Order No. L-22012/499/99/IR (CM-II), dated 06-07-2000 :—

“Whether the action of the Management of IB River Colliery, Mahanadi Coal Fields Ltd., Brajrajnagar, in deducting one day wages of 19-8-1998 of the 38 Workmen (list enclosed) on the ground of no work no pay is justified? If not, to what relief the workmen are entitled?”

2. The 2nd Party being represented by the Union has filed their Claim Statement on receipt of the copy of the reference made by the Government of India (Ministry of Labour). Their case is that, they were regular workers under the 1st Party-Management. On 19-8-1998 they were

deputed in the second shift i.e. from 2 P.M. to 10 P.M. They reported to their duty but there was a major break down in the 'A' Shift. So, no work could be undertaken inside the Mines at the relevant time. The workers (disputants) waited for instruction of the Mine Sardar. They were asked to report at the Tenth incline, which is situated at a distance of about 2.5 Kilometers from their place of work. The disputants could not report at Tenth incline because the said mine was under the control of another Manager, namely Shri S.K. Sinha. So, their attendance could not be marked and one day wages i.e. for 19-8-1998 was deducted on the ground of no work no pay. Hence, they raised a dispute, reconciliation failed and the present reference has been made. Prayer has been made to direct the 1st Party-Management to release the wages withheld by the 1st Party-Management.

3. The 1st Party-Management has filed their Written Statement. It is stated that on 19-8-1998 there was a heavy break down in the Pit No. I. There was no work for the employees. So, the disputants and others who reported for duty were asked to perform their respective jobs in Pit No. II but the disputants did not attend the job. It is stated that, the distance between the Pit No. I to Pit. No. II is hardly 1.5 Kilometers. As the disputants did not work they were not paid wages on the principle of no work no pay for 19-8-1998. The 1st Party-Management has prayed to answer the reference in their favour.

4. On the above pleadings of the parties the following issues have been settled :

1. Whether the reference is maintainable ?
2. Whether the action of the Management of IB River Colliery, Mahanadi Coal Fields Ltd., Brajrajnagar, in deducting one day wages of 19-8-1998 of the 38 workmen as per the list ground of no work no pay is justified ?
3. if not, to what relief the workmen are entitled ?

5. No oral evidence has been adduced on behalf of the Parties. It may be stated here that, after filing of the Claim Statement, the 2nd Party-Union has not taken step and they have not adduced any oral evidence. The 1st Party-Management has filed affidavit and exhibited two documents.

### FINDINGS

#### ISSUE NO. I

6. It is submitted on behalf of the 1st-Party Management that they have not received the copy of the reference and the address reflected in the reference is not correct and so the present reference is not maintainable. I am not inclined to accept this submission. The copy of the reference has been provided by the Tribunal and the address has been corrected. So, the present reference is maintainable.

#### ISSUE NO. II

7. The case of the disputants as claimed in the Claim Statement is that they had attended the duty in Pit No. I, but no work could be done due to heavy break down and they were asked to do their work in Pit. No. II which is situated at a distance of 2.5 Kilometers but they did not report because that mine was the control of another Manager, namely Shri S.K. Sinha. Accordingly to the 2nd Party they attended the duty and so there was no reasons for deducting one day wages. The 1st Party-Management has taken the stand that, as there was heavy break down in Pit No. I the disputants and others were asked to report at Pit No. II. But the disputants did not report for duty at Pit No. II and they remained absent. So, one day wages was deducted on principle no work no pay. The dispute has been raised at the instance of the 2nd Party, so the onus lies on the 2nd Party to establish that, they had reported for duty. The 2nd Party has admitted in the Claim Statement that there was heavy break down in Pit No. I. So, admittedly there no work was available for the disputants and others. It is not the case that only 38 disputants were working under the 1st Party-Management. When instruction was issued to the disputants and others to report at Pit No. II, the disputants could have proceeded to Pit No. II to report for duty. They should not have remained silent apprehending that the manager which allow them to work because the Pit No. II is under the control of another Manager. That would suggest that, the disputants did not work on 19-8-1998. So rightly the 1st Party-management has not paid the wage for 19-8-1998 on the principle of no work no pay. On the other words, the action of the 1st Party-management in deducting one day wages for 19-8-1998 of the disputants on the ground of no work no pay is justified. Hence, this Issue is answered accordingly.

#### ISSUE NO. III

8. As per my findings given in respect of Issue No. II, the workmen of the 2nd Party are not entitled for any relief.

9. Reference is answered accordingly.

Dictated and Corrected by me.

S. K. DHAL, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 25 जून, 2002

का. आ. 2390.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मैसर्स बी. सी. सी. एल. के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण सं. 2, धनबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 92/91/1604) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 25-06-2002 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं एल-20012/(349)/90-आई.आर. (सी-I)]

एस. एस. गुप्ता, अपर सचिव

New Delhi, the 25th June, 2002

**S.O. 2390.**—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 92/91/1604) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, No. 2, Dhanbad now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. BCC Ltd. and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 25-6-2002.

[No. L-20012(349)/90-IR (C-I)]

S. S. GUPTA, Under Secy.

### ANNEXURE

#### BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT DHANBAD

#### PRESENT :

Shri B. Biswas,  
Presiding Officer,

In the matter of an Industrial Dispute under Section  
10(1) (d) of the I.D. Act, 1947

#### Reference No. 92 of 1991

#### PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of  
Kankanee Colliery of M/s. BCCL and their  
workmen.

#### APPEARANCES :

On behalf of the workmen : Shri S. Bose,  
Vice-President,  
R.C.M.S. Union.

On behalf of the employers : Shri H. Nath,  
Advocate.

State : Jharkhand

Industry : Coal.

Dated, Dhanbad, the 13th June, 2002

### AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour in exercise of the powers conferred on them under Section 10(1)(d) of I.D. Act, 1947 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication vide their Order No. L-20012(349)/90-I.R. (Coal-I), dt. 11th April, 1991.

### SCHEDULE

“Whether the 20 persons indicated in the Annexure, who were employed with Shri Chamari Mallah, Contractor, are to be deemed employees of the management of Kankanee Colliery under Sijua Area of M/s. BCCL and whether the demand that these persons be regularised in the services of the said

management is justified ? If so, to what relief the concerned persons are entitled ?”

2. The case of the concerned workmen according to W.S. in brief is as follows :—

It has been submitted in the W.S. that the concerned workmen were employed as Stone Cutter at Kankanee Colliery during the period from 1985 to 1987 and they were paid through contractor namely Shri Chamari Mallah. It has been alleged that as the contractor used to pay less wages they placed their demand for proper wages and for which they were stopped from work. It has been further submitted that they worked under the roof mine with the implements and for the benefit of the management. The real employer was the management and the contractor under whom they were employed was a camouflage contractor with a view to deprive them from their legitimate wages. It has been submitted further that according to Section 10 of the Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act, 1970 employment of the contract labour in some specified jobs were prohibited and knowing fully well of the fact the management forced them to carry on such prohibited job which was permanent in nature. It has been disclosed that as stone cutting job is a prohibited category of job they are entitled to get regularisation of their services. They further submitted that the alleged contractor neither had any licence nor deposits due security money for each contract worker.

3. In spite of intimating all these facts to the management and also in spite of submitting representation for regularisation of their services as they refused to regularise their services, they raised an industrial dispute before the ALC(C) for conciliation which ultimately resulted reference to this Tribunal.

4. The management on the contrary after filing W.S.-cum-rejoinder have denied all the claims and allegations which the concerned workmen asserted in their W.S. The management submitted that there was no employer-employee relationship between them and the persons named in the order of reference. It has been further submitted that one Chamari Mallah who was a contractor was awarded work order for driving incline shaft from surface to 12 Seam at Kankanee Colliery panel west long ago, which was a job of temporary nature likely to be finished within a limited period. Neither Chamari Mallah nor the persons named in the order of reference who were admittedly employed with said Chamari Mallah worked as stone cutter/stone cleaner in Kankanee Colliery. As a matter of fact the contract work allotted to Chamari Mallah was completed long ago. Moreover, these persons never worked under the control and supervision of the employers. Actually, Chamari Mallah contractor exercised supervision and control over those persons and they were paid wages by him. The management specifically submitted further that these persons never employed in prohibited categories

of work prohibited under the Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act, 1970. It has also been submitted that as soon as the contractual work was over the relationship between them and the contractor came to an end and for which the persons who were employed by the said contractor for completing the said job cannot claim regularisation of their services under the management. Accordingly the management submitted that the concerned workmen are not entitled to get any relief which they have prayed for.

5. The points for consideration in this reference are :—

“Whether the twenty persons indicated in the Annexure who were employed with Chamari Mallah, Contractor, are to be deemed employees of the management of Kankanee Colliery under Sijua Area of M/s. BCCL and whether the demand that these persons be regularised in the services of the said management is justified ? If so, to what relief the concerned persons are entitled ?”

#### DECISION WITH REASONS

6. The concerned workmen in order to substantiate their claim examined two witnesses while the management examined one witness in support of their claim. WW-1 in course of his evidence submitted that during the period from 1985 to 1987 he was an employee of Kankanee Colliery as underground stone cutter and he had to carry on the said job in group of 24/25 persons. He further submitted that they used to carry on the said stone cutting job under the direct supervision of the management. He alleged that the management stopped them from working in the said mine when they requested the management to regularise their services. During cross-examination this witness admitted that they do not have any I.D. card, employment card issued by the management to show that they worked as stone cutter under the management in the said colliery. They during this period carried on stone cutting from ground level to underground level. The incline was 450 metres in length and in this way they continuously worked for three years. WW-2 during his evidence also corroborated the facts disclosed by WW-1. On the contrary MW 1 during his evidence disclosed that during the year 1985 to 1987 Chamari Mallah was a contractor at Kankanee Colliery. During this period he made incline shaft from surface to 12 Seam. He completed work for 200 metres out of 240 metres which was the allotted job as per contract. The said incline shaft was dug according to the plan prepared by the colliery. The said plan during the evidence of this witness was marked as Ext. M-1. This witness further disclosed that only that work of incline shaft was given to the contractor Chamari Mallah and he left the job without fulfilling the contractual job allotted to him. He further submitted that no shaft work was undertaken by this contractor or any other contractor or

departmentally in the said colliery. He further disclosed that the said incline was made for the ventilation purpose and it is still now in operation. Such ventilation is a compulsory job in the colliery on the part of the management, and such work was done on the basis of permission given by the DGMS. This witness further disclosed that the concerned workmen used to draw wages for the work done by them from the contractor personally and for which there was no occasion to pay any wages to them by the management. This witness also denied the fact that Chamari Mallah was a fictitious contractor who used to draw bill on behalf of the concerned workmen. Considering the evidence of the concerned workmen and also considering the evidence of the management witness it is clear that during the period from 1985 to 1987 Chamari Mallah used to work as contractor under the management. It is the specific contention of the concerned workmen that they were engaged for underground stone cutting which was a prohibited job according to Section 10 of the Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act. They submitted though they were employed by the contractor i.e. Chamari Mallah the said contractor was a camouflage one and the management in disguise actually used to carry on the work of stone cutting through that fictitious person lest the concerned workmen start agitations for their employment. It has been further disclosed that as for the said job of stone cutting they used to receive less wages they raised their voice and demanded for proper wages from the management. They disclosed that it was the ground for stopping them from work. They further submitted that Chamari Mallah did not deposit the licence fees for the said contractual work. Accordingly as they performed the job of prohibited category and as it was a job of permanent in nature the management cannot avoid their responsibilities to regularise their services. They submitted that when they made representation to that effect the management did not allow them to work further. On the contrary the management admitting facts of existence of the contractor Chamari Mallah during the period in question submitted that as per work order the said Chamari Mallah was entrusted to carry on digging work of incline shaft from service to 12 Seam at Kankanee Colliery panel west long ago and the said job was absolutely temporary in nature. To complete the said work that contractor engaged some workmen but without completing the said job that contractor left. As the said job does not fall within the prohibited category according to Section 10 of the Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act the claim of the concerned workmen for regularisation in service do not arise at all. It has been further submitted that those persons used to draw their wages from the said contractor and for which question of payment of any wages to the concerned workmen by the management never arose. The management further submitted that they were not aware at all if the said contractor paid less wages or not to the workmen. The management categorically denied the fact

that the concerned workmen ever worked under them. In course of evidence the concerned workmen have failed to produce a single scrap to show that they actually worked under the management. The concerned workmen in course of evidence relied on the minutes note of discussion held on 14-7-90 in between the management and the representative of the union. Considering the notes of discussion it transpires that during the said period from 1985 to 1987 Chamari Mallah was offered contractual job in driving of incline shaft which does not come under prohibited category. Further it has been alleged that on verification of records and personal enquiry from the Surveyor and the Superintendent of Mine it was found that different job like drift cutting, lime packing, coal dressing were being done by the labours of Chamari Mallah. It is the specific claim of the concerned workmen that the management engaged them for stone cutting job in the underground mines. From this report I do not find any whisper if the concerned workmen were engaged for doing job of stone cutting in the underground mine. On the contrary the concerned workmen in course of hearing did not consider necessary to examine the Surveyor or the Superintendent of Mines to establish the fact that in spite of existence of contractual job for driving incline shaft Chamari Mallah i.e. the contractor engaged the concerned workmen to carry on the works of prohibited categories under Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act, 1970. However, from this report it is clear that Chamari Mallah was a contractor under the management and he was offered for carrying on for a particular job. Therefore, there is no scope to say as alleged by the concerned workmen that the said contractor was a Sham contractor of the management who engaged the concerned workmen during that said stone cutting contract to perform the alleged job of prohibited category. Excepting this document marked as Ext. W-1 the concerned workmen in course of hearing has failed to produce any cogent document to show that they actually worked under the management. It is the specific claim of the management that the said Chamari Mallah was appointed as contractor to carry on job for driving incline shaft according to the work order. I find this support from the documents marked as Ext. W-1. The management categorically submitted that the job allotted to the contractor to perform was absolutely temporary job and as soon as the said work was completed the relationship between them and the contractor came to an end. Accordingly the claim of the concerned workmen that the job which they performed was permanent in nature finds no basis at all. As the concerned workmen worked under the contractor there was no scope to grow up employer and employee relationship in between them and the concerned workmen and for which their claim for regularisation of service do not arise at all. In the decision reported in SILJ page 3474. Their Lordships of the Apex Court clearly observed that for proper construction of the

definition of a permanent workman is "A workman engaged on a work of permanent nature which lasts throughout the year and who has completed his probationary period, if any, not being one engaged to fill in a temporary need of extra hands on permanent jobs e.g. in leave vacancies." Therefore, relying on the decision of the Apex Court it is clear that the onus rests on the concerned workmen to establish that the job performed by them was permanent in nature. I have carefully considered the materials on record and I have failed to find out an iota of evidence that the management actually employed the concerned workmen to perform the jobs which was permanent in nature. On the contrary it is clear from the evidence of the management that the job which was allotted to the contractor by whom the concerned workmen were employed was, absolutely temporary in nature and the said job was completed long back. The said incline shaft for which work order was issued was for ventilation purpose in the colliery. After careful consideration of all the facts and circumstances I find no sufficient reason to disbelieve the contention of the management in this regard. It is clear that the concerned workmen worked under the contractor in question. According to the decision reported in 2000 Lab I.C. 3656 Their Lordships of the Apex Court observed clearly that the claim of the concerned workmen for regularisation of their service may be taken into consideration if it is established that the contractor under who they worked was a camouflage contractor and actually through that camouflaged contractor the management engaged the concerned workmen for doing certain works of permanent nature and within the prohibited category. I have considered the pleadings of both sides carefully and also the evidence on record and considering all these I have failed to find out any material relying on which there is scope to say that there was no existence of Chamari Mallah through whom the management employed the concerned workmen for carrying on jobs of stone cutting which falls within the prohibited category and also the said work was permanent in nature. The concerned workmen also have failed to produce any authentic document to show that they actually worked under the said contractor. There was scope on the part of the concerned workmen to examine the said contractor as witness on their part. But inspite of getting opportunity they did not consider necessary to do so. In view of the facts and circumstances discussed above there is sufficient scope to say that if all the concerned workmen worked at Kankanec Colliery they worked under the contractor Chamari Mallah to perform the allotted work as per work order which was temporary in nature. As soon as the said job was completed the contract came to an end and no relationship existed in between the said contractor and the management. As such there is no scope to say that there was employer employee relationship in between the management and the concerned workmen. Accordingly I find sufficient reason to believe that the claim of the

concerned workmen finds no stable footing and for which they are not entitled to get any relief which they have prayed for.

In the result, the following Award is rendered :—

“Whether the twenty person indicated in the Annexure, who were employed with Chamari Mallah, Contractor, are to be deemed employees of the management of Kankanee Colliery under Sijua Area of M/s. BCCL and whether the demand that these persons be regularised in the services of the said management is not justified. Consequently the concerned workman are not entitled to get any relief.”

B. BISWAS, Presiding Officer

नई दिल्ली, 25 जून, 2002

का. आ. 2391.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मैसर्स बी. सी. सी. एल. के प्रबंधन के संबद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण सं. 2, धनबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 143/91/1605) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 25-06-2002 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं एल-20012/92/91-आई.आर. (सी-I)]

एस. एस. गुप्ता, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 25th June, 2002

S.O. 2391.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the award (Ref. No. 143/91/1605) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court, No. 2, Dhanbad as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. BCCL and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 25-6-2002.

[No. L-20012/92/91-IR (C-I)]

S.S. GUPTA, Under Secy.

#### ANNEXURE

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT.  
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT  
DHANBAD

PRESENT :

Shri B. Biswas,  
Presiding Officer,

In the matter of an Industrial Dispute under Section  
10(1) (d) of the I.D. Act, 1947

Reference No. 143 of 1991

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Barora  
Area No. 1 of M/s. BCCL and their workmen.

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of the workmen : None.

On behalf of the employers : Shri D.K. Verma,  
Advocate.

State : Jharkhand

239941/02-26

Industry

Coal.

Dated, Dhanbad, the 14th June, 2002.

#### AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour in exercise of the powers conferred on them under Section 10(1)(d) of I.D. Act, 1947 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication vide their Order No. L-20012/92/91-I.R. (Coal-I), dt. 24th October, 1991.

#### SCHEDULE

“Whether the management of Phularitand colliery of Barora Area I of M/s. B.C.C. Ltd., is justified in not paying wages to the workmen (given in the annexure)? If so, to what relief the workmen are entitled to?”

2. The case of the concerned workmen according to Written Statement in brief is as follows :—

In the written statement the sponsoring union on behalf of the concerned workmen submitted that the concerned workmen are permanent workmen of Phularitand and Colliery, Barora Area No. I of M/s. B.C.C. L. working at Barora siding under the control supervision of the management of Muraidih Colliery within the same area and maintaining their service records without any stigma and interruption. Initially, they submitted that the concerned workmen were appointed as wagon loaders and thereafter they had been assigned the jobs of Shale Pickers and have been performing their duties being assigned as Shale Pickers and have completed with the provision of section 25B of the I.D. Act, 1947 in putting their attendance for more than 240 days in each calendar year. They submitted that in spite of performing the job of Shale Pickers the management provided them with the pay scales of Wagon Loaders Time Rated without changing the designation. Accordingly the sponsoring union submitted several representations with the claim for changing the designation of the concerned workmen and thereafter on the basis of mutual discussion held on 5-5-89 in between the representative of the management and the union amicable settlement was agreed upon the regularise the concerned workmen as Shale Picker with proper pay scale and other benefits applicable to them. But in spite of the said amicable settlement the management violated to implement the said order. Not only, that the management stopped work of the concerned workmen with effect from 14-10-89 without any notice under Section 25F of the I.D. Act, 1947 and arbitrarily kept them out of employment though the workmen concerned did not commit any act of negligence on their part in this regard. The sponsoring union accordingly submitted that the concerned workmen are legally entitled to full wages and other consequential benefits from 14-10-89 till the date of their resuming duties.

3. The management on the contrary after filing W.S. cum-rejoinder have denied all the claims and allegations which the concerned workmen asserted in their W.S. It has been submitted by the management that the workmen are entitled to get wages for the days they performed their duties and not entitled for wages for the days of their absence from work. They submitted that the concerned workmen were previously holding the substantive post of quarry workers used to be deployed as wagon loaders and thereafter as Shale Pickers as and when required on alternative jobs, whenever no job in the open cast workings was available. Due to non-availability of job at open cast working at Phularitand Colliery of Barora area the

concerned workmen could not be provided with their substantive job and were given alternative job at Barora sidings as wagon loaders. But the concerned workmen started agitating for their regularisation on time rated jobs as Shale Picker in Cat. I and also remained absent from their duties with effect from 14.10.89. The management submitted that inspite of repeated request the concerned workmen did not resume their duties. On the contrary they continued to remain absent from their duties demanding regularisation of their jobs as Shale Pickers. The management submitted that the concerned workmen were the piece rated workers and they were given piece rated job on the same terms and conditions taking into account the nature of job involved in coal loading. They had worked before some time as Shale Picker and some time as wagon loaders and they had to carry on the piece rated jobs of wagon loading on regular basis. The management further submitted that due to the adamant attitude of the concerned workmen and also in order to avoid labour unrest they ultimately was compelled to regularise the concerned workmen as Shale Picker and deployed them in the collieries of Barora area and accordingly some of the concerned workmen joined the said colliery in the month of May, 1990 and some in the month of August, 1990. They further submitted that the concerned workmen remained absent from their duties from 14-10-89 at their own violation in order to pressurise the management for their conversion from piece rated worker to time rated workers and for which they cannot claim wages for the period of their absence without permission and without authorisation. Accordingly they are not entitled to get wages for the period of their absence voluntarily and for which they are debarred from getting relief which they have prayed for.

4. The points for decision in this reference are:—

“Whether the management of Phularitand Colliery of Barora Area I of M/s. BCCL is justified in not paying wages to the workmen (given in the annexure)? If so, to what relief the workmen are entitled to?”

#### DECISION WITH REASONS

5. The management in order to substantiate their claim examined one witness while the concerned workmen did not adduce any evidence on their part. Considering the evidence of the management and also considering the facts disclosed in the pleadings of both sides there is no dispute to hold that the concerned workmen were to workmen under the management. The concerned workmen in the W.S. admitted that originally they were appointed as wagon loader and thereafter they had been assigned to perform the job of Shale Picker which were permanent in nature. It is the contention of the concerned workmen that as the management refused to regularise their services as Shale Picker in Cat. I they submitted representation and in course of discussion in between the union and the management, the management decided to regularise their services as Shale Picker with proper pay scale and other benefits applicable to them but inspite of that amicable settlement the management violated to implement the said order. On the contrary with effect from 14-10-89 the management stopped their work without any notice though there was no negligence on their part. Accordingly they have claimed that they are entitled to get wages and other consequential reliefs with effect from the said date till the resumption of their duties. On the contrary it is the claim

of the management that the concerned workmen with effect from 14.10.89 stopped work without assigning any reason. Instead of resuming their duties they started agitation for regularisation of their services as Shale Picker in Cat. I. The management further submitted that they requested the union as well as the concerned workmen to resume their duties but they did not do so. Ultimately in order to avoid industrial unrest in the colliery the management accepting their claim regularised their services as Shale Picker and deployed them in the collieries of Barora area. On the basis of the said order some workmen resumed their duties in May, 1990 and some in August, 1990. The management submitted that as the concerned workmen wilfully remained absent from work they are not entitled to get any wages and consequential reliefs with effect from 14-10-89 till they resumed their duties. It is the specific contention of the concerned workmen that the management forcibly stopped them from work with effect from 14-10-89 without assigning any reason though they did not commit any act of negligence on their part. Therefore, it has to be decided whether the management was responsible for stopping the work of the concerned workmen with effect from 14-10-89 or not. MW-1 during evidence categorically denied the fact that they stopped work of the concerned workmen during the said period. On the contrary it has been specifically submitted by MW-1 that it was the concerned workmen who started not only agitation for regularisation of their services in Shale Picker as Cat. I but also to create pressure upon the management stopped work. The concerned workmen inspite of getting opportunity did not consider necessary to adduce any cogent evidence with a view to substantiate their own claim. The facts disclosed in the W.S. and rejoinder submitted by the sponsoring union cannot be considered as substantive piece of evidence, untill and unless it is corroborated by cogent evidence. As such relying on the facts disclosed in the W.S. and rejoinder I find little scope to uphold the contention of the concerned workmen particularly when the management by adducing cogent evidence specifically denied their claim. It is not expected that a workman will get wages inspite of remaining himself absent without assigning any reason or without getting the leave sanctioned. Here it is seen that the concerned workmen stopped work with effect from 14-10-89. No evidence is forthcoming to the effect that they remained absence after getting their leave sanctioned. The claim of the concerned workmen that the management stopped them from work finds no basis in absence of any Cogent evidence. Accordingly at this stage after careful consideration of all the facts and circumstances I do not find any sufficient reason to disbelieve the evidence of the management that the concerned workmen wilfully not remained themselves absent from duty only with a view to creat pressure on them for regularisation of their services as Shale Picker in Cat. I. In view of the facts and circumstances discussed above I hold that the concerned workmen are not entitled to get any back wages with effect from 14-10-89 till the date of resuming their duties. In the result, the following Award is rendered:—

“The management of Phulartand Colliery of Barora Area I of M/s. BCCL is justified in not paying wages to the workmen (given in the annexure). Consequently, the concerned workmen are not entitled to get any relief.”

B. BISWAS, Presiding Officer,



**ANNEXURE**

1. Lakhan Gour.
2. Akashwa Rajbarin.
3. Basdeo Nonia
4. Joti Mahto
5. Sitwa Bhuini.
6. Jhabo Mohlin.
7. Chapla Domin.
8. Laxmania Kamua.
9. Tori Kumar.
10. Bilmuni Majhian.
11. Balika Mohlin.
12. Shanti Kamin No. 2
13. Nageshwari Bai.
14. Kalabati Bhuini.
15. Rabi Manjhi
16. Tatia Mumharin.
17. Usman Mia
18. Khamlal Dome.
19. Tufan Min.
20. Habin Mia.
21. Nasi Min.
22. Fuliwa Kamin
23. Sundri Kamin.
24. Budhwara Bai.
25. Bundia Kamin.
26. Mahabir Kumhar.
27. Mithai Kumharin
28. Dhulman Kamin.
29. Bhilmuni Domun.
30. Gandhi Kamin.
31. Kapurwa Kamin
32. Dukhi Bhuia.
33. Basuri B.P
34. Keshwari Chamain.
35. Reshmi Kamin.
36. Bhogta Kumharin.
37. Bhuneshwari Kamin.
38. Chukuwar Bai.
39. Dwarik Bhuia
40. Dhanmatia Kamin

नई दिल्ली, 25 जून, 2002

का. आ. 2392. — औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मैसर्स सी एम पी डी आई एल के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण सं.-2, धनबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 117 का 1991) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 25-6-2002 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[ सं. एल-20012/(25)/91—आई.आर. (सी-I) ]

एस. एस. गुप्ता, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 25th June, 2002

**S.O. 2392.**—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 117 of 1991) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. II Dhanbad now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. CMPDIL and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 25-06-2002.

[No. L-20012/(25)/91-IR (C-I)]

S.S. GUPTA, Under Secy.

**ANNEXURE**

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (No. 2) AT DHANBAD**

**PRESENT**

Shri B. Biswas,  
Presiding Officer.

In the matter of an Industrial Dispute under  
Section 10(1) (d) of the I.D. Act, 1947.

REFERENCE NO. 117 of 1991

**PARTIES :**

Employers in relation to the management of  
C.M.P.D.I.L, Ranchi and their workman.

**APPEARANCES :**

On behalf of employers : Shri B K. Sinha,  
Authorised  
Representative.

On behalf of the workman : None.

State : Jharkhand : Industry : Mine Planning

Dated, Dhanbad, the 14th June, 2002

**AWARD**

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour in exercise of the powers conferred on them under Section 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947 has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication vide their Order No. L-20012/(25)/91-IR (C-I), dated, the 22nd July, 1991.

**SCHEDULE**

"Whether the action of the management of Central Mine Planning & Design Institute Ltd., Ranchi is justified in not regularising the services of Sh. Deonarayan Mahta, in Cat. II (NCWA) as Mali from 13-3-81? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled and from which date?"

2. The case of the concerned workman according to the W.S. in brief is as follows :—

It has been submitted that the concerned workman was in continuous employment under C.M.P.D.I.L. since 13-3-81 as Mali. The Union submitted further that although the job of Mali is a perennial in nature and falls in Cat. II of NCWA the concerned workman was wrongly termed as casual with a view to deprive him from the status and privilege of permanent workman in the category of Mali and accordingly he was paid Rs. 10/- per day as wages. They submitted further that the concerned workman had put in physical attendance of 221 days in 1981 and 300 days in 1982 and so in subsequent years. The Head of office in his office note dt. 23-4-84 advised CMPDIL Administration to regularise the services of the concerned

workman against the available vacancy of Mali since he had already been qualified for regular absorption and he had been found to be a competent worker. The union further alleged that the concerned workman though worked as Mali he was placed in so-called Cat. I with effect from 17-12-85. Particularly when there was no post or provision for Cat. I casual under the NCWA. They submitted further that in terms of certified S.O. a workman engaged in work which essentially of casual nature alone fall under classification of casual workman. Mali being a regular post and the job of Mali being perennial in nature and when similar workmen are in regular rolls in Cat. II the concerned workman could not be legally termed or classified in as casual. They alleged that the management did so with a view to deprive the concerned workman from the wages of Mali and Attendant service benefits of Cat. II and thereby indulged unfair labour practice. Accordingly the union submitted that the concerned workman is legally entitled to be regularised with effect from 13-3-81 in Cat. II as per NCWA, and accordingly he is entitled to get all other service benefits consequent to fixation in the grade of Peon with effect 8-5-90 together with other facilities with retrospective effect.

3. The management on the contrary after filing W.S.-cum-rejoinder have denied all the claims and allegation which the concerned workman asserted in the W.S. They submitted that the concerned workman was engaged as casual Mazdoor with effect from 21-9-83 and he completed qualifying attendance of 240 days in the year 1984-85 and based on the recommendation of the committee he has been placed in Cat. I with effect from 17-12-85 and subsequently regularised as Cat. I with effect from the date he was placed in Cat. I. It has been further submitted that in the year 1983 for Public interest a Writ petition bearing No. 9677 of 1983 was filed before the Hon'ble Supreme Court seeking regularisation of the alleged workmen who had been working with the management in different designations with effect from the date of mentioned against each individual. The name of the concerned workman also appeared in the list claiming to have worked as Mali with effect from 13-3-81. In the counter affidavit they submitted clearly that what ever claim with regard to designation and initial date of engagement made before the Hon'ble Supreme Court was without ascertaining the facts or instruction of such persons. The Hon'ble Supreme Court by a Judgement dt. 20-2-89 directed the management to consider the claim for regularisation of the remaining workmen etc. The concerned workmen who happened to be the on the manpower list under the management at the time of Judgement. Accordingly the case of the concerned workman did not come under direction of the aforesaid judgement which was only in respect of regularisation of such persons and when traced out. Since the concerned workman was already in the manpower list there was no question of being traced out. They further submitted that the Hon'ble Apex Court also did not direct the management to regularise all the persons in the designation claimed with effect from the dates shown against their names in because of the facts that the Hon'ble Apex Court was not satisfied with the claim of the Union. However, pursuant to the said judgement the management regularised 19 persons as Cat. I Genl. Mazdoor and engaged 15 workmen as casual Cat. I based on the recommendation of the committee and also 19 workmen as casual Cat. I based on the settlement with the concerned union. The management also submitted

that pursuant to consultation between the union and the CIL it was resolved that all workmen/employees will be given copies of Service excerpts and any dispute if raised subsequently will be disposed of on the basis of the said service excerpt. The concerned workman did not file any dispute on the service excerpt form with regard to his designation. In the event he had been working in any designation other than that mentioned in the service excerpt. He could have brought where of any discrepancy in the service excerpts form. The management submitted that in view of the circular for filling up the vacancies for the post of Peon the concerned workman appeared before the selection committee as Cat. I and on the basis of the recommendation of the committee he was placed as Peon with effect from 8-5-90. They submitted further that neither the concerned workman nor the union raised any dispute since 1990 when the concerned workman was given Cat. I and was subsequently regularised also and thereafter he having appeared before the selection committee has since been appointed as peon with effect from 1990. Accordingly the management submitted that the claim of the union for regularisation of service of the concerned workman in Cat. II as per NCWA finds no basis at all and for which the concerned workman is not entitled to get any relief which he has prayed for.

4. The points for decision in this reference are :—

“Whether the action of the management of Central Mine Planning & Design Institute Ltd., Ranchi is justified in not regularising the services of Sh. Deonarayan Mahato, in Cat. II (NCWA) as Mali from 13-3-81? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled and from which date ?”

#### 5. DECISION WITH REASONS

It is seen that the instant case was taken up for exparte hearing as the concerned workman as well as the Union inspite of getting sufficient opportunities had failed to appear and also to adduce evidence in support of their claim. The management in order to substantiate their claim examined one witness. MW-1 in course of evidence disclosed categorically that the concerned workman used to work under him as casual labour. His service was regularised with effect from 17-12-85 accordingly he submitted that the claim of back wages by the concerned workman since 13-3-81 had no locus standi because during the said period he did not work under the management for 240 days in a calendar year. This witness further submitted that subsequently after regularisation the concerned workman was promoted to in post of Peon as per recommendation of the selection committee. The management during evidence of MW-1 relief on the service excerpt of the concerned workman which was marked as Ext. M-1. The management submitted that the concerned workman did not raise any dispute relating to his claim in the service excerpt form which was supplied to him. I have considered the service excerpt form marked as M-1 carefully and from this form it is seen clearly that the concerned workman did not raise any dispute relating to his claim. It is the specific claim of the union that the concerned workman started working as Mali since 13-3-81 and in the year 1981 he attended 221 days of work while in 1982 and onwards 300 days of work. The Union further submitted that the concerned workman was a Mali and he worked under the management in that capacity since the said period. As the post of Mali is perennial one and falls within Cat. II under NCWA he is very much entitled

to get his regularisation in the said category. On the contrary the claim of the management is that the concerned workman was engaged as casual mazdoor with effect from 21-9-83 and he was placed in Cat. I with effect from 13-12-85 as per recommendation of the committee and subsequently regularised as Cat. I with effect from that date. Thereafter he got his promotion as Peon in the year 1990. Considering the facts and circumstances it appears that the claim of the union goes far away from the claim of the management. Onus accordingly rests on the union/concerned workman to establish that the concerned workman acted as Mali since 13-3-81. It is seen that in spite of getting sufficient opportunity the concerned workman did not consider necessary to adduce any evidence with a view to substantiate his claim. As such just relying on the facts disclosed in the W.S. submitted by the union at this stage I do not find any scope to uphold his contention. Facts disclosed in the W.S. cannot be considered as substantive piece of evidence unless and until it is supported by cogent evidence. As the concerned workman in spite of getting sufficient opportunities has failed to substantiate his claim at this stage I do not find any scope to uphold his contention and also to give relief according to his prayer. In the result relying on the evidence of the management I find no other alternative way but to hold that the concerned workman is not entitled to get any relief which he has prayed for. In the result, the following Award is rendered :—

“The action of the management of Central Mine Planning & Design Institute Ltd., Ranchi is justified in not regularising the services of Shri Deonarayan Mahato, in Cat. II (NCWA) as Mali from 13-3-81. Consequently, the concerned workman is not entitled to get any relief ”

B. BISWAS, Presiding Officer.

नई दिल्ली, 26 जून, 2002

का. आ. 2393.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 17 के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मैसर्स बीसीसी एल के प्रबंधन के संबंध में नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच, अनुबंध में निर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण सं.-1, धनबाद के पंचाट (संदर्भ संख्या 36/95/990) को प्रकाशित करती है, जो केन्द्रीय सरकार को 26-6-2002 को प्राप्त हुआ था।

[सं. एल-20012/(342)/93—आई.आर. (सी-I)]

एस. एस. गुप्ता, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 26th June, 2002

S.O. 2393.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the Award (Ref. No. 36/95/990) of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal/Labour Court No. 1 Dhanbad now as shown in the Annexure in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. BCC Ltd. and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 26-06-2002.

[No. L-20012/(342)/93—IR (C-I)]

S. S. GUPTA, Under Secy.

## ANNEXURE

### BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. I DHANBAD

In the matter of a reference under Sec. 10(1) (d) (2A) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

#### Reference No. 36 of 1995

**PARTIES** : Employers in relation to the management of Burragarh Colliery of M/s. B.C.C. Ltd.

AND

Their Workmen.

**PRESENT** : Shri S.H. Kazmi, Presiding Officer.

#### APPEARANCES :

For the Employers : Shri H. Nath, Advocate.

For the Workmen : Shri S. C. Gour, Advocate.

State : Jharkhand. Industry : Coal.

Dated : 18th June, 2002.

#### AWARD

By Order No.L-20012/(342)/93-I.R. (Coal-I) dated the 5th April, 1995 the Central Government in the Ministry of Labour, has, in exercise of powers conferred by clause (d) of Sub-section (1) and Sub-section (2A) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 referred the following dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal :

“Whether the demand of the union to claim regularisation by the management of Bhalgora Area of M/s. BCCL of Shri Rajdeo Sonar and 155 others (As per list enclosed) is justified ? If so, to what benefits are these workmen entitled and from which date ?”

2. Precisely, the case of the sponsoring union is that the concerned workmen were employed as general mazdoors in different time-rated capacities by the management of Burragarh colliery of M/s. BCCL since the year 1989 and as they had no bargaining power, they accepted whatever the wages were being paid to them which was far below the normal wages being paid to the regular and permanent general mazdoors of the said colliery and besides that other facilities, such as, quarterly bonus, LTC & LLTC were also denied to them. Further it has been said that Kustore Shramik Sahayog Samitee took up the cause of the workmen with the management for their regularisation and to enroll them on permanent muster-roll of the company. It is said that initially the management made assurance but nothing tangible was done thereafter. It is said that the management took the work continuously from the concerned workmen without

regularising them with the sole object of depriving them of their status and privileges of permanent workmen and as such the management's action amounts to unfair labour practice. Further, the case is that all the concerned workmen have been working in different prohibited categories of work like general mazdoors for more than 2/3 years from 1989 to the end of 1992 and as such the works are permanent and perennial in nature and prohibited under the Contract Labour (Regulation & Abolition) Act and the notification made therein as well as the terms of NCWA-IV in vogue at the time of reference. When the dispute was raised before the A.L.C. (C), it is said, no conciliation could be materialised and ultimately the same has been referred to this Tribunal for adjudication. Lastly, it has been said that the concerned workmen are entitled for regularisation in time-rated category w.e.f. 1990.

3. The management, on the other hand, in its written statement apart from raising the question pertaining to the maintainability of the instant reference has come out with the case that the concerned workmen were never under the employment of the management at any point of time, rather they were members of a registered Co-operative Society under which they were working. Further, it has been said that the concerned workmen were employed by the Secretary of the Co-operative Society who was entrusted with the execution of jobs by the management and the wages etc. to the concerned workmen were all along paid by the Secretary of the Co-operative Society. It is also said that the said Co-operative Society in respect of the work done by it used to receive A/c payee cheque from the employer from their own arrangement for payment to their Co-operative workers to which the management had no concern, and therefore, no relationship of employer and employee existed between the workmen and the management. Further, the case is that the Kustore Shramik Sahayog Samitee, the Co-operative Society of which the concerned workmen were the members used to employ those workmen under the Co-operative Society, and therefore, liability to regularise such workmen under the Co-operative Society cannot be fastened upon the management. It is also the case that the concerned workmen were used to be engaged by the said Co-operative Society purely on temporary basis against the temporary nature of job, and therefore, regularisation of those employees in the employer-company does not arise.

In its rejoinder also to the written of the sponsoring union while making parawise comments several averments made in the said written statement were denied and it was reiterated by the management that at no point of time the relationship of employer and employee existed between the concerned workmen and the management. In view of all the statements made lastly it has been stated that the concerned workmen are not entitled for any relief whatsoever.

4. Considering the stands taken on behalf of either sides, as noticed above, it becomes apparent that moot question which appears to be involved and which requires consideration is whether at all there was relationship of employer and employee between the concerned workmen and the management whether the concerned workmen had worked continuously for a period of 190 days or 240 days in one calendar year as General Mazdoors so as to claim regularisation.

5. The fact as regards engagement of the concerned workmen through a registered Co-operative Society, named, Kustore Shramik Sahayag Samitee is not in dispute, rather stands admitted. Now the claim of the sponsoring union is that though the concerned workmen were engaged through the said Co-operative Society but for all practical purposes they were under direct control and supervision of the management and they were paid their wages also directly by the management and besides that for the purpose of getting the works done they were supplied the implements also by the management. In support of such contention being raised the workmen rely upon the statements of two witnesses and few documents which during the evidence were marked as Exts. W-1 to W-4 which are mostly the noting sheets by which work order was made in favour of the Co-operative Society.

So far the management's stand upon the aforesaid aspect is concerned, as it has been noticed above, it denies the existence of any relationship between the two sides and says that at the highest the concerned workmen can be taken to be the workers or the persons hired by the said Co-operative Society from time to time for getting the works done and for which they were paid by the said Co-operative Society.

6. In the aforesaid context now it has to be seen and consider as to how far the claim of the concerned workmen can be said to be justified in view of the materials collected in course of the proceeding.

Out of the two witnesses examined on behalf of the workmen WW-1 is one of the concerned workmen who speaks about his engagement in the concerned colliery between 9-3-79 to December, 1992. According to him, he was engaged by Kustore Shramik Sahayog Samitee like other concerned workmen and further according to him, they all were working as Tyndal and General Mazdoor. He has stated that articles for working was supplied by the Engineer of the colliery and the work was supervised by the Sirdar and other supervisory staff of the management and further he says that payment was made to them by M/s. B.C.C. Ltd. and attendance was also marked by the management. He has proved certain documents which are Exts. W-1 to W-3. In his cross-examination he has said that he was member of the Co-operative Society and the said Co-operative Society was given work by work order of M/s. BCCL. He further proceeded to say that payment

was made to Co-operative for the work done by BCCL. He has also said that no separate individual paper or appointment letter was given to them by BCCL and further has said that they all were engaged by the Secretary of the Co-operative for work. It is thus evident from the evidence of this witness that he accepts that he and others were engaged by the Secretary of the Co-operative for work and the said Co-operative Society used to get the work order from M/s. BCCL and for the work done M/s. BCCL used to make payment to the Co-operative Society. Though initially this witness has stated about their direct engagement and direct payment of wages by the management but the statement made by him in course of his cross-examination rather support the stand taken by the management as noticed above.

WW-2 is also one of the concerned workmen and like WW-1 he also says about their engagement by the said Co-operative Society. However, he has said that their work was supervised by the Manager and Supervisor of the colliery and implements for work were also supplied to them from the godown of the colliery. Further, according to him, attendance was marked by the Attendance Clerk of the colliery and payment was made to them from the counter of M/s. B.C.C. Ltd. He has also said that their attendance was for more than 240 days in one calendar year and they were issued Identity Card also. However, few statements made by this witness during his cross-examination are relevant to be noticed. Apart from making few statements about the said Society he has stated at one place that payment for work was made by the management by cheque once and thereafter cash payment was being made. Though initially also he has not made any such statement that he and others were being paid daily wages by the management and if paid then they were paid at what rate and the written statement of the sponsoring union is also silent about the mode of payment or about the rate of wage per day or per month. But the aforesaid statement made by this witness supports the case of the management that after getting the work done at a time payment used to be made to the said Co-operative Society which it used to distribute amongst the workers who used to be engaged for getting few specific work done within a specified period. This witness has further proceeded to say that he has got no paper to show that they were engaged by the management of M/s. B.C.C. Ltd. He has also said that their Co-operative Society has got Attendance Register in which their attendance is marked. As regards Identity Card, he has said that he has got the same from the said Society. No any register or any document whatsoever has been filed on behalf of the concerned workmen to show that they all were the members of said Co-operative Society and being in that capacity their attendance used to be marked by the said Society. Therefore, both the witnesses of the workmen in course of their cross-examination have either contradicted their earlier statement or have made

inconsistent statements which rather go to support the case of the management. More particularly WW-1 has clearly accepted that the workmen used to be engaged by the Secretary of the Co-operative Society and the said Co-operative Society used to get the work order from the management and after performance of the work the said Society used to be paid by the management. In view of such statements being made by this witness it is difficult to infer in their favour that they, in fact, were engaged by the management and were also paid their wages by the management.

On the other hand, those two witnesses examined from the side of the management have categorically stated about the existence of the said Co-operative Society which, according to them, was working as a contractor for doing certain jobs. The said Society, according to them, were provided work occasionally after assigning the work for certain period on the basis of the work order issued to them and the work order was being issued in the name of the Secretary of the Co-operative Society. WW-2 has also said that on completion of work the management used to issue cheque to the Secretary of the Co-operative Society and it was the Secretary who used to maintain the attendance register of its workers and used to pay them their wages. Such statement made by this witness found full corroboration from the statements made by the witnesses of the workmen (WW-1 and WW-2) in course of their cross-examination as mentioned above. Nothing seems to have been elicited out of them in course of the cross-examination of the management's witnesses which in any way could discredit their testimony or could support the claim of the concerned workman materially or substantially.

7. Out of the documents filed as mentioned above Ext. W-1 is the registration paper of the said Co-operative Society. Ext. W-2 is a note-sheet dated 4-5-81 under the signature of the concerned authority of the management and from the contents of which it appears that due to shortage of manpower and due to extreme emergency the said Co-operative Society was engaged to get some transporting work done and for which lump sum amount of Rs. 486.68 paise was fixed. By the said document the request was made to accord the approval for getting the job done contractually. It is apparent from the said document that those two transporting jobs were done on 3-5-89 and for the first job, 14 workers were engaged and, for the second job, 9 heads were engaged. Ext. W-3 is authorisation in favour of the Secretary of the said Co-operative Society for getting the job of sump cleaning done within six weeks and a particular amount was fixed as estimated cost. Ext. 4 is another note-sheet dated 18-3-89 regarding transportation job being done by the Co-operative tyndals due to shortage of departmental tyndals. It is apparent from the same that it was also for a fixed amount and for few days work. Therefore, from these

documents which are for the period between the years 1989-90 it becomes apparent that few specific jobs were provided to the Co-operative Society and for which fixed number of co-operative mazdoors or tyndals were engaged, sometimes 10, sometimes 14 and likewise and for getting those works done fixed amount was paid and it has already come in the oral evidence that the amount for the work done was paid to the Secretary of the said Co-operative Society. As such, from these documents continuity of the working of Co-operative workers or mazdoors do not become apparent and further it does not become clear that all the 156 concerned workmen were engaged through the Co-operative Society for getting the management's work done. These documents also do not show that after the performance of the work allotted the workmen were paid individually by the management, rather it becomes apparent that a lump sum amount was paid for the specified work done within a specified period. In nutshell those documents are not of much help for the concerned workmen and out of them it cannot be conclusively gathered that all the concerned workmen were engaged continuously either for two or three years by the management for discharging the duties of general mazdoors. No any document has been filed relating to the said Co-operative Society in order to show marking of attendance of the concerned workmen and the performance of their jobs from time to time on the basis of different work orders which could reflect the continuity of work performance.

8. It has been urged on behalf of the workmen that in the instant case the management did not produce the Attendance Register, Cap Lamp Register etc despite initiative taken by the workmen in that regard and so due to non-production of the same which could have helped the concerned workmen, the adverse inference is required to be drawn against the management. I do not find much force in such submission. The onus was upon the sponsoring union or the concerned workmen to establish their claim and in a recent decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court also it has been so held. That decision is reported in 2002(1) LLJ 1053(SC).

As it is obvious from the above the concerned workmen have failed to establish either through oral or documentary evidence that they were, in fact, the employees of the management and worked continuously for more than two or three years for which the payment of wages was also made by the management and so in such circumstances merely on account of non-production of few documents by the management no inference in favour of the claim of the concerned workman can be conclusively drawn. In the instant case it is also to be noticed that right from the beginning the management is denying the relationship of employer and employee between the two sides, and not only the management's witnesses have supported its case, rather to a maximum extent the workmen's witnesses have also corroborated its stand taken.

9. By referring few authorities the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the sponsoring union or the concerned workmen in course of the argument tried to emphasise that the contractual agreement or the existence of contractor in the shape of Co-operative Society was mere a camouflage to deprive the concerned workmen from their lawful claim of regularisation or the payment of due wages and in fact there was direct relationship of employer and employee between the two sides. Particularly after coming into existence of a recent decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in SAIL's case reported in 2001 Supreme Court Cases (L&S) 1121 it stands well settled that in case of contractual engagement or in a case where there is notification under Sec. 10 of the Contract Labour (Regulation & Abolition) Act prohibiting certain nature of jobs there cannot be any automatic absorption, rather several factors are required to be considered before deciding whether the relief can be granted or not. Reiterating the earlier views taken, it has also been held therein that relief of regularisation or absorption can be granted if it stands established that contract system was mere sham and camouflage and in fact the workmen concerned were the employees of the management and the direct relationship between them existed. In the instant case there does not appear to be anything on the basis of which it can be held that the contractual engagement or the contract system was mere a camouflage and in fact, for all practical purpose the concerned workmen should be taken to be the employees of the management. It is obvious from the findings arrived at above based on materials on record that it is difficult to come to the conclusion that relationship of employer and employee existed between the two sides and that the concerned workmen worked continuously under the service of the management either for 190 days or 240 days in one calendar year or for two or three years as claimed.

10. In view of all the aforesaid considerations and discussions it is concluded that it stands not established that there was any relationship of employer and employee between the concerned workmen and the management and further it is not proved that the concerned workmen worked under the management continuously for a period of two or three years or for a period more than 190 days or 240 days in one calendar year and so the claim for regularisation as raised, is devoid of merit or substance.

11. The award is, thus, rendered as hereunder :

The demand of the union to claim regularisation by the management of Bhalgora Area of M/s. BCCL of Shri Rajdeo Sonar and 155 others, as per list attached to the order of reference, is unjustified, and the concerned workmen are not entitled to any relief.

However, in the circumstances of the case, there would be no order as to cost.

S. H. KAZMI, Presiding Officer